

VOLUME 21

NUMBER 11

PRICE 8p

Christian Order

Summary of Contents for November, 1980

NATIONAL PASTORAL CONGRESS : A MINORITY REPORT	<i>Father Michael Clifton and Others</i>
LIBERAL REPRESSION WITHIN THE CHURCH	<i>The Editor</i>
A CHRISTIAN MARTYR OF OUR TIME	<i>Helle Giorgiadis</i>
LIFE AFTER DEATH	<i>Fr. George H. Duggan</i>
A NEW COLONIALISM	<i>Paul Crane, S.J.</i>
NOSTALGIA	<i>Burke Cosgrove</i>

READERS

please note that as from December, the annual subscription to *Christian Order* will be £2.00 and \$5.00 by surface mail. We ask November renewers, if possible, to renew at these new rates. We raised them with the utmost reluctance, but the change was forced on us by heavily rising costs. We count on your support. With many thanks.

—Paul Crane, S.J.

Contents

Page

514 TRUE BALANCE *The Editor*

516 THE NATIONAL PASTORAL
CONFERENCE
Fr. Michael Clifton

523 LIBERAL REPRESSION
WITHIN THE CHURCH
The Editor

534 NOSTALGIA *Burke Cosgrove*

536 A CHRISTIAN MARTYR OF
OUR TIME *Helle Georgiadis*

542 THE CHRISTIAN MIND:
AWARENESS OF EVIL
Henry Edwards

547 THE CONGRESS:
A MINORITY REPORT
Fr. Michael Clifton and Others

554 LIFE AFTER DEATH
Fr. George H. Duggan, S.M.

560 THE CHURCH, POLITICAL
ORGANIZATION AND
VIOLENCE: 3
*The late Archbishop Romero and
Bishop Arturo Damas*

571 BOOK REVIEWS
Paul Crane, S.J.

If You Change Your Address:

Please let us know two or three weeks ahead if possible and please send us both new and old addresses. Thank you.

Christian Order is a magazine devoted to Catholic Social Teaching and incisive comment on current affairs in Church and State; at home and abroad; in the political, social and industrial fields. It is published ten times a year.

It is published by Father Paul Crane, S.J., from 65, Belgrave Rd., London, S.W.1. This is the sole postal address to which all communications concerning *Christian Order* should be sent.

Christian Order is obtainable only by subscription and from this address. In the case of those desiring more than one copy, these are obtainable at the subscription rate and should be paid for in advance.

The annual subscription to *Christian Order* is £1 in the United Kingdom and Republic of Ireland; \$3.00 in the United States, Canada and Australia; elsewhere, according to the approximate sterling rate of exchange, in the currency of the country concerned or any convenient currency.

Air-mail rates as follows:

U.S.A., Canada
India, etc.—£4.00, U.S. \$8.00
Australia—£4.50, A. \$8.00
N. Zealand—£4.50, N.Z. \$8.00

Christian Order

EDITED BY

Paul Crane SJ

VOLUME 21

NOVEMBER

NUMBER 11

True Balance

THE EDITOR

I CANNOT see that anything is to be gained by blinding ourselves to the fact that we Catholics are, at present, members of a divided Church. This is sad, but it is no more and no less than the truth; and the truth should always be faced. I can see, however, that maybe much is to be gained by *acting* as if there were no divisions within the Church even though we remain fully aware of their existence. This applies both to Traditionalists and Progressives, the main contestants in the ring for the past fifteen years or so. In other words, why should not both, without prejudice to their own particular points of view, bring their concentration to bear on the things that unite us as Catholics, rather than on those that divide us.

A start could be made by anyone interested, with a piece of paper and a pencil. Let him list on that piece of paper the beliefs which the Teaching Authority of the Church bids him and all Catholics uphold, what might be called his own particular private beliefs and practices that he engages in; and, then, those of which he no longer approves. Let him do this and then arrange to meet an opposite number who has done the same (say, Traditionalist to meet Progressive or vice versa); and compare notes. I think they would both be surprised at the width of agreement between them. Let them proceed from this point; keeping together and sustaining each other where there is

agreement; where there is not, agreeing to differ for the time-being, whilst proceeding to the next point of agreement that calls for their joint support. I think both Traditionalists and Progressives (if they worked in a mixed group, which would be the best) would be not merely surprised, but amazed at the amount they had in common. Now the wood can be seen by both because its trees are viewed in true perspective. The sight is a good one; the whole worth not merely dying, but living for.

Traditionalists and Progressives can proceed further—point counterpoint, so to say—with the things that unite their primary business; those that divide, deliberately and for the time-being, their secondary concern. Some, to right and left in the Church, would call this betrayal. I respect this attitude in some. In others, I fear, it serves as a cover for growing unease, which can stem from many causes. What I find sad is that those who speak of betrayal in these matters and are very rapid with their accusations to this effect, incline to the use of a type of language in the expression of their views, which is not infrequently abusive and can be arrogant to an extreme degree. Very often, I am afraid, this is the mark of a mind well wrapped in blinkered self-containment: closed completely because frightened to be opened towards the right or left, whichever the case may be. This is a great tragedy of the contemporary Church. It is rarely mentioned, but, surely, many must have noticed it. The polarization should not be there. Extreme groups to right and left within the Church are sharpening it and doing great damage thereby. We should do our best to restrain, with what they appear to be without at the moment—the love of Christ in our hearts.

Not the least benefit of the practice suggested here is that it will allow many contestants to right and to left to take a look at themselves, as they now are and maybe for the first time; and, in the process of so doing, correct their separate stances in the interests of true equilibrium. True balance is not compromise. It is not an easy thing to keep. It requires true grit. We need it badly, all of us, in the Church today.

We are very grateful to Father Michael Clifton and the Latin Mass Society for permission to reprint, in the shape of an article, the talk on the National Pastoral Congress, held in the early days of May, 1980, which he gave to the Society at their Annual General Meeting on June 21st of this year. The Minority Report to which Father Clifton makes reference in the concluding stages of his address, is published in this same issue of *Christian Order*. Our only regret is that earlier publication could not be arranged; but printing schedules made this quite impossible.

The National Pastoral Congress

A PRIEST - DELEGATE'S REFLECTIONS

FATHER MICHAEL CLIFTON

AS many of you already know I was chosen to be a delegate to the National Pastoral Congress on behalf of my Deanery, Merton, in Southwark Diocese. I was a late replacement because my predecessor as Deanery Representative was moved to another Deanery. I was able to choose my Sector at the Congress and chose Sector A dealing with the People of God; and the topic group in that sector dealing with the Local Church, Dioceses, Deaneries, Parishes, Basic Christian Communities and Prayer groups.

Now the Congress came out with a very large number of resolutions which can be roughly described as in three categories—quite good, very debatable, and utterly unacceptable. But by and large I would personally describe the Congress as a potential disaster for the Church in this country. It was clear that the great majority of delegates were what one generally calls “activists”. In Sector A,

at least, I felt that there was a strong element of anti-clericalism, not of course aimed at the Priests and Bishops present in that Sector, but at many of the delegates' own Parish Priests, who were felt to be obscurantist, obstructive, and blockers of lay initiatives.

Most of the delegates seemed to be middle or upper class and could well have afforded to pay their own way at Liverpool. Instead of that, they were offered free accommodation with families at the families' own expense, and free travel by their diocesan organisations. I hate to think what the total expense of the Congress was, but it must have been around £150,000; and all this was found, in effect, from the pockets of parishioners all over the country, even if they had no interest in the Congress. As you are well aware, most Catholics in this country regarded the whole matter with complete indifference judging by the poor turnouts at the special meetings and services held at local level before the big day.

Traditionally-minded Catholics viewed the Congress with deep suspicion from the start and their suspicions were fully justified in the event.

I expect that most of you have heard of the tremendous euphoria generated at the Congress among the delegates. Far from feeling euphoric I felt quite ill after the long Monday session and it took me several days to recover from the shock of the events of that day. I regret that, as far as I can ascertain, a large number of Bishops seemed to share in this euphoria and are quite convinced that the Church in this country is on the brink of dramatic new developments under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, Who is about to lead us all into exciting new approaches and insights. In other words, be ready lads for more big changes!

I can hardly stress too much that this Congress was indeed very important and that the decisions made by their Lordships at their July Meeting could indeed determine the fate of the Church in this country for years to come. If many of the resolutions made at Liverpool are accepted, then I forecast that the already existing split between furtherance and conservationist Catholics (to use recent jargon-words) will widen dramatically.

What I have to say now concerns primarily Sector A in which I sat, but the same spirit prevailed in most of the Sectors. If you have read the reports you will notice that running throughout is the idea that parishes must be divided into small groups, prayer groups, loving, caring and sharing (Co-op) groups, etc.; that there must be a great deal more consultation at all levels which will involve the setting up of endless committees to deal with everything from liturgy to one-parent families and so on. There will have to be a widespread re-allocation of resources for the financing of these committees. We are all urged to have a greater "awareness" of a large number of problems. (All of which have existed for years, incidentally, and are dealt with often by the State Social Security system, though admittedly not always very well. But, even when the State system falls down, the Catholic Church through organisations like the SVP and Legion of Mary is often able to arrange help). Well, I call on their Lordships' to say a firm NO to most of the proposed committees and re-allocation of resources. However, that is perhaps not the main purpose of my being here this morning. You would like to hear what went on during the fatal Monday session in Sector A.

Sector A had 5 topic groups and each topic group had produced a report. These reports consisted of resolutions. In some cases there were over 20 resolutions per topic. The day started with Topic A, The Worshipping Community; in other words, the Liturgy. After two rather innocuous resolutions, the first horror came with resolution 3. That liturgical groups be established in parishes and that, as a consequence of our common participation by baptism in the Priesthood of Christ, the maximum involvement and ministry of the laity, both men and women, be encouraged in the preparation and celebration of the liturgy. At once a delegate rose to complain that it was not strongly enough worded. She demanded that the words "men and women without discrimination" be employed. I rose to ask what exactly was she getting at, women priests perhaps? No, it was not that; in fact, she was asking among other things for women or girl altar servers. Anyway, the amendment was passed overwhelmingly. I am

sure you will note that the resolution contains several ambiguities. For instance, our "common participation in the Priesthood of Christ" almost suggests that the laity are the same as the ordained priesthood. Even if it was not intended to mean that, it by no means follows that the "priesthood of the laity" should lead on to maximum involvement in what is essentially the activity par excellence of the Ordained Minister, the Priest. Indeed, the very use of the word "ministry" in the resolution is suspect . . . Did they mean, say, "special ministers of Communion" or were they using the word, as they did so often in all the reports, to mean "gifts the laity may have". In fact of course, the norms for participation in the new rite of Mass are clearly laid down and I personally see no need for any liturgical committee at Parish level to try and dictate to me how I should say Mass. I may say that, in my first Parish, I started off by forming such a committee, but after three meetings it became clear that that was exactly what they thought they should do . . . tell me how to say Mass. That was the end of that committee.

The resolution was voted on and passed with about half a dozen votes against.

The next resolution called for the formation of small groups for prayer, scripture and Mass to be set up as necessary for the building up of the parish community and as an aid to celebration. The "small groups" mentality ran through the Congress. I rose again to suggest the word "necessary" be replaced by "useful". This was rejected and the whole motion went through by a vast majority.

The next resolution was the purest of pure jargon. It was passed by a large majority. These are the words of the last sentence "That the eucharistic community be a welcoming one to newcomers, visitors and others and that the sense of community created in celebration should issue into a caring for the community and for those who do not belong to the Church". I leave that without further comment . . . It is meaningless; i.e. the opposite to meaningful.

Then came the crunch resolution as far as the Latin Mass Society was concerned. "That the greatest possible variety of the celebration of the eucharist within due limits should be allowed to meet the needs of different ages,

children, teenagers, ethnic groups and others". At topic level, the Latin Mass Society had tried to introduce the question of parity for the old rite of Mass. Here they lost by only a majority. They tried to reintroduce the matter again, but the chairman ruled it out of order on the grounds that it had been defeated at topic level. One priest present at the topic level discussion then rose to state that this was unfair discrimination against the Society on such a vital issue and the assembly should vote on it. This plea was rejected. While the assembly of Sector A was basically composed of furtherance Catholics, I felt that they might have given a vote in favour, in view of the wide wording of the resolution in front of them. Of course, as applied to the new rite of Mass, the resolution is quite ridiculous. The more variations you introduce into the liturgy the more divisiveness you create. But you would hardly expect Sector A to accept that. The resolution was then passed with the usual hands raised against . . . very few in number.

The next resolution called for Holy Communion under both kinds to be established as the norm and for the creation of as many lay ministers—both men and women, as are necessary for this and other purposes—to be trained and commissioned. I rose to enquire that "other purposes" might mean. It appeared to refer to the possibility of the lay administrators giving Benediction.

As there has been a papal statement on both the use of Communion under both kinds and the employment of special ministers for Communion in recent weeks, I should like to take this opportunity of calling on their Lordships to state that this resolution is quite simply no longer in order. At the Sector, of course, it passed with the usual large majority.

The liturgy topic concluded with a couple of resolutions on confirmation and a plea that the sacraments be regarded as community celebrations and that baptism and the sacrament of the sick should take place during Mass when possible. There was also a strange "joker" resolution which asked that, if and when baptism has to be delayed through lack of faith on the part of the parents, a

service of blessing for their infants should be held. That I think can only be described as a sick joke.

The resolutions on the local Church, Diocese, Parish Deanery, etc. were less controversial, except for No. 4: "In order to become a loving, caring, worshipping community we recommend that parishes should become a communion of Christian communities incorporating small neighbourhood, area and special-interest groups including all, lapsed and practising. They should meet for prayer, social events and occasionally the Eucharistic, supporting one another in times of stress, sorrow and joy". The aim appeared to be to divide up parishes into groupings of about 200 people and that each grouping should provide its own activities with the priest as a kind of co-ordinator. I understand the scheme is already at work in Hemel Hempstead. They now have 10 such basic communities. What happens to ordinary parish life I dread to think . . . The Church of the future . . . Lord help us.

The resolutions on corresponsibility and consultation were rewritten at the last moment by an intense looking nun, whom I rather irreverently nicknamed Sister Trenderosa. Anyway they were strengthened considerably and contained plenty of "musts", "necessary", "insist on", "essential" and like words. A resolution on parish councils stated that "where the final decision belongs to the parish priest (it always does, as these councils are only consultative) the Council is entitled to an explanation of any refusal he may make to its recommendations". I rose yet again to try and tone this down. I suggested; "If the parish priest refuses to accept recommendations, he should in charity explain his refusal". This was rejected by the assembly on the grounds that it was the right of councils in justice to demand such an explanation . . . that if refusal continued there should be the further right of appeal to the Deanery. Yet a few minutes earlier the assembly had passed a resolution stating that "Priests and People should love one another".

Possibly the worst horrors of the day lay in store in the topic of Church Unity. You may have read about this already; so I shall simply summarise. The resolutions were as follows. The first thanked God for the marvellous

progress towards unity in the last fifteen years and particularly thanked the theologians who have sat on the various commissions. This was, of course, in reference to the infamous A.R.C.I.C. reports on "Ministry", "Eucharist" etc., known as the "Agreed Statements". I almost got up to suggest that for A.R.C.I.C. we should read "AN ARCHIC". Then followed the resolutions calling for a quite wide extension of the use of intercommunion for spouses of inter-Church marriages and the proposal for the Catholic Church in England and Wales to join forces with the British Council of Churches as a full member instead of as an associate member. Only 24 voted against intercommunion and only 8 against full membership of the B.C.C. There was also a call for joint Christian schools at all levels and that no building should be undertaken without consulting other local Churches on the ground that this would "institutionalise our decision making".

To conclude, I should like to call on their Lordships to reject the elements of the Congress which called for an extension or alteration of the Church's *Magisterium*, on points like intercommunication, contraception, women priests, the admission of divorced and re-married Catholics to Communion. I should also like to see the Bishops make a statement that they do not consider it necessary to set up a vast new bureaucracy in the Church in this country.

Furthermore, I would stress that this Congress was *not* genuinely representative of Catholic Opinion in this country. What we call the "average man and woman in the pew" was simply not there. The working class was not there. The immigrant community had sparse representation, and the ordinary loyal simple Catholic simply did not want to know. Please Bishops, remember that when you meet and don't fall into the trap that the Dutch fell into when they held a pastoral congress. The risk is there; you could split the Church in this country. Priests and people generally will reject the new proposed bureaucratic system. They will vote against it with their feet. You have been warned. Now we wait for the future.

A Gallup survey has shown that the reaction of rank - and - file Anglicans to their new-language services, which have been on an experimental basis for ten years, is largely negative. Despite this the new services tend to predominate as a result of pressure exercised by "trendy" clerics. The story parallels closely that within the Catholic Church. What you have within the Catholic Church now to a greater or less degree is repression by a new Liberal Establishment determined to enforce its will on the Faithful in disregard, if need be, of papal authority.

CURRENT COMMENT

Liberal Repression within the Church

THE EDITOR

"IT is time the clergy back-pedalled". Thus the *Times* (12-6-80) in comment on the results of a Gallup survey devised and sponsored by Professor David Martin, a sociologist of religion at the London School of Economics. The survey, whose results were published on June 11th, revealed what Clifford Longley, *Times* religious correspondent, described as "a serious split between the Leadership of the Church of England and the ordinary churchgoing members" (12-6-80).

Results of a Survey

The split has to do with the new, modern-language services of the Anglican Church, couched in what Longley somewhat wryly describes as "modern ecumenical prose", and which have been in experimental use for the past ten years. Despite this—and largely because of the "with-it" fervour of "trendy" Church of England clergymen—the

new-language services, according to Longley, have almost wholly taken over from the old, couched in the lovely prose of the seventeenth-century Book of Common Prayer. What the Gallup survey reveals is that there is, within the ranks of the laity of the Church of England, no more than a minority backing for this change, which, presumably, will receive official endorsement when the new-language services are published in the form of a new Prayer Book, equal in status, I presume, to the Book of Common Prayer, open to use, therefore, as a legitimate alternative and, as such, almost certain to replace it at the instance of trendy C of E clerics, who would appear in this matter to bear a remarkably close resemblance to their R.C. counterparts. One remembers a not unaffectionate couplet circulating in Oxford a good time ago:

"The Rather Rathes go to the Cowley Fathers
The Whole Hoggers go to Alywoggers".

Such is no longer the case.

Yet, according to the Gallup survey, the changes envisaged, as Longley writes in his *Times* piece, are:

"... clearly contrary to the wishes of substantial sections of the church-going population, and it appears that young people and working-class people — two groups for whom it is said the new versions were especially tailored — are no happier than the rest.

Perhaps most telling of all statistics produced by the Gallup survey is one that shows that only 7 per cent of regular church-goers describe themselves as 'very happy' with the new services; and only 3 per cent of those between the ages of 16 and 24.

Those 'more than regular' in their religious observance, who attend church once a week were divided equally, with 18 per cent very happy, 18 per cent very unhappy, and the rest in between.

Professor Martin said at a press conference yesterday (11-6-80) that he hoped the survey would help to persuade the clergy how little support there was for the new services, and that the wishes of congregations would therefore be taken more fully into account in deciding whether to use the new or the old".

Disregard of the Rights of the Faithful

If the experience of the last fifteen years within the Catholic Church is anything to go by, I am forced to say that, in my view, there would appear to be little likelihood of Professor Martin's hopes being realised. The story, as so many of us within the Catholic Church know only too well, has been one, not only of the introduction of new forms, but of their introduction overnight and, in not a few cases, to the point of an excess for which the personal whim of a particular cleric has combined with his disregard of ecclesiastical authority to make him largely responsible. When this has occurred, as it has all too often, there has been, in fact, no means of redress open to the outraged laity. The rights of the Faithful in this matter have been disregarded for years. It is just possible we may be in sight of a change here. Last May (1980), the Sacred Congregation for the Sacraments and Divine Worship published a ten-page Instruction, *Inaestimabile Donum*, as a follow-up to Pope John's letter to the Bishops of the World on the Holy Eucharist, which was published in February of this year. The Instruction condemned the abuses, which falsified the liturgical reforms of the Second Vatican Council. It laid down 27 regulations concerning the conduct of Mass and the treatment of the Blessed Sacrament. And it goes out of its way to make clear that, by so doing, it is *adding nothing* to the rules already in force. The implication, of course, is that abuse is rife; otherwise, why should the Sacred Congregation go out of its way in a social Instruction to reiterate rules that had already been published?

Probable Fate of a Liturgical Instruction

All of which makes one wonder whether the Instruction from the Sacred Congregation for the Sacraments and Divine Worship will have the slightest effect on the current trend of liturgical practice in this country or elsewhere within the Church. I am inclined to doubt it. "The question now arises", writes the *Catholic Herald* (30-5-80) in comment on the Instruction, whether the firm indications of the Instruction will have the desired effect. The language it uses seems strict, but a comparison with the docu-

ments sanctioned by Vatican II shows they use the same tone". And—is this it by implication—if the documents of Vatican II were treated so lightly, is there any reason to believe that the 27 regulations laid down by the liturgical Instruction will not receive the same fate. In other words, as the *Herald* commentator sees it—probably with accuracy—episcopal authority will not lend itself in any strong way to liturgical enforcement. It has lent itself to the toleration of liturgical anarchy in the past. It is more than likely to do so in the future. I should imagine it is. Which means that the Instruction will be disregarded; then forgotten. The anarchy will continue—to the enormous detriment of the Faith. One wonders what loyalty to the Holy Father means—getting all tizzed up about the possibility of his visiting this country; or giving his commands effect at grass-roots and at no matter what cost to oneself. How many bishops are prepared to do this. They are prepared to ride in his train when he makes his journeys; to share his triumphs with the vast crowds that turn out to greet him wherever he goes. But how many are prepared to drink his chalice with him? This is the test. 'I have kept my eyes and ears open these past two years. I have not noticed many episcopal volunteers.

It is certainly not the wish of the Faithful that the liturgical anarchy within the Church should continue. Nevertheless, in default of episcopal firmness in this matter and of which at present there is no evidence, the Faithful will find it almost impossible to withstand the pressure of trendy clerics, intent on manipulating the liturgy for their own ends and to the point of excess: this the "trendies" will do, despite the point made in the Instruction — and which has been made often enough before—that the Faithful have the right to liturgical truth. Yet it is this which they are so constantly denied and, as often as not, by those very same clerics who take time out in the pulpit to call for Social Justice for the Third World, about which I am forced to remark, having noted the sayings of many of them for a dozen years or so, they appear to know next to nothing at all. One wonders why the Faithful are denied justice in liturgical matters by those who call for it so loudly elsewhere.

No Contact with the Liturgical Grass-Roots

It could be that those responsible for liturgical affairs are so far removed from the mind of the Faithful, so out of contact with those at the grass-roots of the Church that they have, quite literally, no idea as to what those who live their lives there really do think about the contemporary liturgical scene. Not the least astonishing sentence in the *Catholic Herald's* (30-5-80) comment on the Instruction already referred to in this article was that which embodied a remark made by Father Anthony Boylan, National Adviser for Liturgical Formation in England and Wales. "Most of the Catholics in England and Wales", he said, "will be quite unaware of most of the abuses mentioned in this document" (the liturgical Instruction). That really is a good one! In view of my own personal experience (and that of others placed similarly to myself), in the shape of letters received and points made over the telephone and in direct conversation, not merely in this country but in a good many others, I can only say that I find Father Boylan's remark incredible, simply incredible. It reveals a mind completely out of touch with the liturgical grass-roots in this country. I reason this way—by implication, Father Boylan would seem to be saying that the Faithful are unaware of liturgical abuses in this country for the simple reason that there are very few of them. For, if there were more than a few, the Faithful would complain and their complaints would reach him, wouldn't they? *Would* they, my dear Father, that is the question. The Faithful know from bitter experience that it is quite useless to bring to ecclesiastical authority or its bureaucracy any complaints they may have with regard to liturgical or other abuses within the Church. They know this because they know from bitter experiences their complaints have been disregarded. This way they got tired. So, they stopped complaining. From which Father Boylan would appear to conclude that the Faithful have, in fact, no complaints about the liturgy, which means that, so far as he is concerned, there are few abuses; which means that the 24 regulations contained in the Instruction are cautionary and nothing more. Meanwhile, the right of the laity to liturgical truth continues to be disregarded.

The New Liberal Establishment

This could be the story. Whether it is or not, one general point has to be made, which has great bearing on the question under discussion; which is, why are the Faithful denied justice in liturgical matters? The point I would make now is that, within the Church today, you have, at what might be called diocesan and middle-range level, the domination of a new Liberal Establishment that has climbed to power in the wake of Vatican II and that is forcing its teaching and practice in all fields—the liturgical is only one — on the Faithful, with the compliance of extremely weak bishops and despite the express injunctions of the Holy Father to the contrary. In his stand for the things of the Faith, Pope John Paul has the support of the vast mass of the Faithful; but his wishes are thwarted — with the result that no practical effect is given to his words — at grass-roots level by a firmly entrenched, new Liberal and Neo-Modernist Establishment within the Church, which is determined to go its own way and take the Church its own way in disregard and in defiance, if necessary, of the Pope. The battle is here. Nowhere else.

Liberal Repression Within the Church

Professor James Hitchcock has described the emergence and increasing domination of this new Liberal Establishment within the Church in the United States in his most recent and, to my way of thinking, brilliant book, *Catholicism and Modernity* (1). What he says of his own country is undoubtedly applicable elsewhere. One has watched the same trend in the United Kingdom for some years. The syndrome is more or less universal within the Church in what may be called the developed world. Some months ago in a short piece in the *National Catholic Register*, Professor Hitchcock spoke of the “larger hypocrisy which surrounds the whole question of freedom in the Church” and continued:

“The standard line which is purveyed in the secular media and liberal Catholic circles is that the Second Vatican Council brought a new spirit of freedom and

(1) Obtainable from St. Duthac's Book Service, 39 Blenheim Park Road, South Croydon CR2 6BG, U.K. Price £8.70.

diversity to the Church. Divergent opinions could now exist side by side. To be a Catholic did not require adherence to any 'party line'. If only conservatives could learn to accept this situation, so the argument runs, there would be no problems. Live and let live.

"There is a corollary to the argument. Unfortunately, we now have a Pope from a backward country who does not understand the workings of freedom. He is reintroducing repression into the Church, and this will have the effect of sowing division and conflict.

"The Anglican historian, E. R. Norman, has observed that people generally talk of 'pluralism' only during the transitional phase from one kind of orthodoxy to another. Once a new orthodoxy has been established, it is enforced, and all pretence of pluralism is dropped.

"This is precisely what has begun to happen in the United States in the past few years. Not only have dissenting Catholics gained the right to exist, in certain places they have become dominant. And where they have become dominant they have been *employing systematic repression against those who do not agree with them* (Itals. mine)".

This is exactly the way it goes. Within the Catholic Church today, as in the life of society generally, no-one is more illiberal than the Liberal Catholic when in a power position and bent on the prosecution of his liberalism. Until he is in this position, his plea is for tolerance in the name of a bogus pluralism, which he uses to discredit the old orthodoxy in favour of what he thinks of as the new; in the Catholic Church today, this adds up to a libertarianism in aid of secular and self-centred, human fulfilment. Once established as dominant, exponents of this new creed, which they identify with the new, post-conciliar Church, set out on a course of repression against all who disagree with them. They use with ruthlessness the positions of power and influence they have captured already within the Church's establishment to extend their new liberal and libertarian empire. In the piece already referred to, Hitchcock goes on to cite examples. Before doing so, he says by way of foreword, "In each case I

have personal knowledge of the situation, or else have been told about it by someone who does have personal knowledge". A catalogue much longer than his could be set down here, and on the same basis; but let his suffice. Readers will have their own lists. Here is Hitchcock's:

"A new bishop comes into a diocese and orders the dismissal from the seminary faculty of those professors whom he deems to be 'outside the mainstream of American theology'. 'They are given no hearing and no formal charges.

"A seminary professor who protests against certain irregularities in the seminary where he teaches is dismissed by the rector of the seminary and receives no support from the personally quite orthodox bishop of the diocese.

"A seminarian, because he expressed disagreement over unauthorized liturgical practices in his seminary, is forced out of the religious community and told he is unfit for religious life.

"A seminarian close to ordination is told he is too 'rigid' and must leave his community. Only a strong groundswell of support from other priests averts this occurrence.

"A seminarian rebuffs a homosexual advance from a fellow student. In subsequent 'peer evaluation' homosexual seminarians declare the first student to be unfit for the priesthood. Seminary authorities dismiss him despite strong evidence that he has been the victim of a conspiracy.

"A young woman applies for a teaching position in a Catholic high school. The nun-principal asks her views on women's ordination. When she replies that she does not favour it, she is denied the job because 'we want to be open to all points of view'".

How Vigorous Can Papal Action Be ?

Hitchcock concludes quite correctly: "The blunt truth is that there is a well-organized and widespread process of liberal repression in this country. Orthodox Catholics are denied in effect the right to exist". He adds: "Quite understandably, many of them see vigorous Roman action,

overriding the injustices perpetrated by the 'local Church', as the only thing which can save them". Hear, I fear, the question is begged. What I would like to know is *how*—just *how*—vigorous papal action is going to override the injustices perpetrated at grass-roots level within the local church. Note, please, that I say papal and not Roman action, as Hitchcock does. I do so deliberately because it is not clear to me that, even in this Pontificate, papal action is identical with Roman action and vice versa. The latter could still be obstructive. One would like to know what gets through to Pope John Paul. Many, indeed, are writing to him. He cannot handle all his mail personally. Others must handle it for him. What part of it does he see? What people does he see? If the Holy Father's magnificent and back-breaking attempt to bring true renewal to the Church is to succeed, it must have the support of a Roman Curia totally loyal to him and as determined as he is to bring the work of restoration and true renewal to a successful conclusion. Has he such men around him? I do not know.

Episcopal Support Essential

Good though it would be if he had the total support of like-minded men around him, this in itself is not sufficient—in no way sufficient—to do the work that is so needed within the Church today. The all-important point remains. The work of restoration will go through and prove effective if and only if the Holy Father's words are given practical effect at the grass-roots of the Church. For this the active co-operation of the Bishops is absolutely essential. Yet, so far, it does not appear to have been forthcoming. Both in Ireland and the United States, as I have noted already in *Christian Order*, very little effective action has followed the splendid words the Pope spoke with such courage in both countries. Once the initial euphoria that flowed in the immediate wake of the papal visit had passed, there came no more than a massive silence. Which makes one wonder what kind of follow-up there has been in the months that have passed (just over a year, in fact) since the Apostolic Exhortation on Catechesis or Christian Formation was published on October 16, 1979. The same

applies to the Letter to the Bishops of the Church on the Holy Eucharist, which was published on February 24th, 1980. What precisely has happened between then and now, particularly in the shape of the correction of those abuses which were referred to in the Letter and specified in the Instruction issued by the Sacred Congregation for Liturgy and the Sacraments to which we have already referred in this article and whose English translation was published in the *Osservatore's* English edition for June 9th, 1980; the Instruction itself having been issued on April 3rd of the same year. One asks, and is entitled to ask, what precisely has been done in this liturgical field, as well as in the field of Catechetics, to correct prevalent abuse in accordance with the mind of the Holy Father, which has been so clearly expressed on these matters. One can put the same question with regard to two further documents from the Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education on "Spiritual Formation in Seminaries" and "Liturgical Formation in Seminaries", issued respectively in January, 1980 and June, 1979 and published together in the English edition of the *Osservatore Romano* for April 21st, 1980 after a somewhat inexplicable delay. Just about everything necessary for true seminary restoration and renewal is there. Again one asks, has anything been done to carry out, give concrete application to the Holy Father's wishes in this matter of seminary formation, as well as those of Catechetics and the liturgical life of the Church. Has anything been done; and, if not, why not? Many in the Church have been overjoyed to find in these documents official and public expression of what they had so long advocated themselves, particularly, perhaps, with regard to the most pressing needs of the seminaries, which are seen and set out so bravely in the two documents from the Sacred Congregation for Catholic Education in essentially spiritual terms. At the same time, they see very little evidence of the injunctions contained within these documents being given practical effect. Who is responsible for this being done at diocesan level? Who, but the bishops, and what signs are there that they have any real intention of doing it? Is it inertia that prevents them from acting? Or, have they, quite simply, given up? Are they under the

thumb of "the professionals" who compose the post-conciliar national and diocesan bureaucracies and who are themselves representative, for the most part, of the new libertarian secularism that has laid hold on so large a segment of priests and religious in the wake of the Second Vatican Council?

Papal Words Without Effect

What we have at the moment, I am afraid, is the last thing we should have; a desupernaturalized Church largely in the hands of a very active, vociferous, liberal minority clustered round a repressive clerical core. Under these circumstances, I do not see how the supernatural can be restored to the Church except that the members of that minority be removed (they will only go screaming) from their present positions of power by the strongest and toughest kind of papal action. Nothing less will suffice. For my own part, I am quite sure that action of this sort will have to come. Neither dialogue nor exhortation will suffice to restore to the many within the Church, who long for it, that sense of the supernatural which is being stripped away from their lives by a liberal and libertarian minority determined to substitute for it something that is, in fact, no more than a crumpled humanism.

This is the present position. The papal words have been spoken. They are magnificent. 'They must be given practical effect at diocesan and grass-roots level within the Church. For this, episcopal action is essential. So far, it has not been forthcoming. It is, in fact, conspicuous by its absence; which means, in fact, that the Pope's words are having no effect. At this point, this is the brutal reality, which all of us have to face. There is only one way out and this must be taken if the Church is to go forward as it should.

Nostalgia

BURKE COSGROVE

SHE fitted well into the parish which had been founded 150 years. She was old, widowed, lived alone in a single-family house. She had never lived anywhere else. Most of the houses around her contained people as old as herself and she knew most of them from childhood. The neighbourhood was a modern phenomenon, having hardly changed at all in over a century. She had attended the parish school, received all the sacraments for the laity in the church, had seen her seven children married there and her husband buried there. She had known oh so many of the priests, having watched them come and go for over 70 years. She had her lonesome moments, of course, but her surroundings showed up her identity day after day. Her house was only a block away from the church and she was glad to be living in "an old people's parish".

Her happiest moments were at the 9 o'clock Mass on Sunday. The old-time hymns lifted her soul and many times she could feel the tears come. As a matter of fact, the singing was very good, the old people really making the walls resound with "Mother Dear O Pray For Me", "To Jesus Heart All Burning", "Holy God We Praise Thy Name". The enthusiasm of the hymns attracted non-parishioners and, surprisingly enough, many of them were young people.

Maybe she should have known that good things don't always last forever. Anyway, it took her quite a while before she realized that things had changed. She wasn't being given as many chances to sing as formerly. The new pastor was responsible for this. Every once in a while, now, an old hymn would be played but they became scarcer and scarcer. The day arrived when she didn't recognize any of the hymns at all, although she made a faithful effort to follow the words and music when the commentator announced, "We shall sing Hymn No. 7 on page 22". She didn't succeed, nor did anyone else. Finally she became quiet on

Sundays, like so many others, and the old hymns began to die quietly in her breast.

She was much too faithful a Catholic to complain, being of that wonderful old school which thought everything "Father" did was right, but she really *did* feel a sadness—the old hymns echoing and re-echoing in her heart.

Somebody must have complained, however, because one Sunday the pastor gave a special sermon on the music. He was astonished and annoyed that anyone should actually miss the old hymns. He stressed the fact that the Church was a growing organism which could not stay still, which simply *had* to shed things of the past that impeded its growth. He looked sternly down into the pews from the height of the pulpit. Eyes, well over 70 years of age, looked up at him with reverence. "You are all guilty of nostalgia", he told them, "and there's no place for *that* in a living church". "Nostalgia" was not too-familiar a word to them but they only hoped it wasn't sinful. They didn't realise that it could be a very pleasant word, that there was nothing wrong in being nostalgic, that it could mean a healthy longing for the joys and pleasures of long ago, for the scenes of childhood, for far-away Christmases and celebrations with dear ones and friends long ago gone to God, for all the hymns and poems and songs that reminded them of those things—things which had occurred to them within the very bone and marrow of their faith. Not that they ever for a minute wanted to return to childhood (far from it!) but it was so consoling to them now, in their old age, to be *still* singing to Jesus and Mary and the angels and saints the same hymns they had sung as children, only now with a faith that was as staunch as the walls of the church and as true as the time-worn lyrics.

Wasn't it Mauriac who said that we never lose our childhood but constantly return to it, especially as we near the end of the trail? A pity, then, that it should be forbidden to old people to sing songs of the centuries, songs which have never aged in their hearts. A pity that they should, like the poor widow of the parish, remain silent while all the world sings. And a pity that they, of all people, in the name of nostalgia, should not be able to sing, with all their hearts, to God at eventide.

A Christian Martyr of our Time *

HELLE GEORGIADIS

IN his Foreword to a recently published biography of Cardinal Mindszenty*, Fr. Werenfried van Stratten contrasts today's neglect of the Church's confessors and martyrs with the love and honoured remembrance given by the early Christians to those who suffered persecution and death for Christ's sake. He says: "the decadent West would rather live in peace with pagans and murderers than with God himself, the tears and blood of the persecuted are an embarrassment and a hindrance to the deals of businessmen and the negotiations of diplomats". Even in the great family of the Catholic Church, he adds, the "most afflicted of God's children are denied and forgotten—or, as Hansjakob Stehle puts it in his book on the Vatican's *Ostpolitik* — are considered idiots by their own brothers and sisters".

These are strong words and will shock or displease many armchair Christians in the West, but Fr. Werenfried speaks with the practical experience of one who has visited and involved himself with the victims of persecution and of man's inhumanity to man in every area of the world where Christian faith is the road to martyrdom. Eastern Christians who have personal experience of this hard road have special cause to be grateful for Fr. Werenfried's understanding and response to their plight.

Christian martyrs are true *witnesses* to Christ: that is, their reaction to the forces of evil are Christ-like so that through their example we can recognise how Christ himself would have responded in similar circumstances — and indeed *how Christ has responded* through his faithful disciples—to both the brutal and the subtle attacks on his person and his kingdom. A biography of Cardinal Mindszenty is therefore much more than a tribute to a great

*Acknowledgements and thanks to the Editor of *Chrysostom*.

man and it deserves to be read and taken very seriously, for it is also a guidebook for the many frightened and confused followers of our Lord today who seek to remain faithful to him under threats of violence and the moral temptations to rationalise 'evil' as 'good'.

The form temptation takes for the Church today is different from that faced by our Lord in the wilderness: it is no longer *power* that the Tempter offers as the reward for those who accept his rule but *human survival*. This change in form, however, in no way alters the single objective of Evil which is to alienate man from God and that, for a Christian, would mean to work with those who are determined to wreck the mission of the Son of God who was sent to save man precisely from this fate.

Marxist ideology is presented to Christians today by its supporters as the only effective way of realising the Kingdom of God on earth, and cooperation with communists is promoted, even by some who profess the Christian faith, as a sensible and compatible way in which Christians and Marxists can work hand-in-hand to achieve a collectivist society — albeit an atheist one — *for the glory of mankind*. Those who oppose such views are immediately branded as political reactionaries, and then quickly rejected as outcasts from the 'progressive society' which vaunts itself as the only one which cares for the poor and the oppressed. This brainwashing, to which all of us alive today have been subjected, has clouded our moral judgement and sapped our determination to accept only Jesus as the Way, the Truth and the Life.

Cardinal Mindszenty, who was born in 1892 and gave his witness to Christ in this context of our times, did not escape the calumnies cast on his motives nor the brutal assaults of persecution. The Marxist-atheists imprisoned and tortured him in their efforts to destroy him as Primate of the Church in Hungary, but they did not kill him, because to have done so would have made him an obvious martyr around whom the faithful could rally. It was the Vatican which exiled him from Hungary and deposed him as Primate. His ultimate martyrdom was not at the hands of Marxist revolutionaries but through the implementation of *Ostpolitik*—a form of 'softly, softly' diplomacy designed

to win favours from the communist governments of eastern Europe—which was introduced during the pontificate of John XXIII and actively developed by Pope Paul VI. Mgr. Dr. József Közi-Horvath who wrote this biography was a friend and close associate of Cardinal Mindszenty and shares the same undeviating loyalty to the Holy See which the Cardinal displayed throughout his life. But neither he nor the Cardinal can hide the facts of history which give their own disturbing testimony, like stones crying out when men remain silent.

THE PROBLEM OF 'DETENTE'

The critical dilemma which faces all non-Marxist leaders who are responsible for the government of men, both in politics and in the Church, is whether and in what circumstances a policy of "expediency" can have moral justification. For a Marxist, expediency is self-evidently the proper course to follow in every situation because it is axiomatic that the Marxist goal always justifies the means of achieving it. In Christian morality there are some situations where the issues are so complex that the decision rests on a knife-edge, but expediency itself can never claim absolute, self-justifying priority, and it is here that the divide between Christian and Marxist morality is unbridgeable.

Both the political initiatives for *Détente* and the Vatican's *Ostpolitik* have to be based on the assumption that those engaged in a dialogue share the same principles of morality. It is therefore assumed that 'dialogue' is intellectually open. The actual situation, however, is quite different. In Marxist régimes the permitted options are strictly limited from the outset and those who engage in dialogue with them are offered two options only — Compromise or direct Collaboration. Moreover, these 'options' are not even alternatives because according to Marxist rules every 'compromise' has to be a step towards 'collaboration'. If this were not so, attempts at 'dialogue' would become 'confrontation', and to a Marxist *confrontation* is a very dirty word indeed since it is synonymous with opposition to Red Star Utopia.

Cardinal Mindszenty and others who have lived under communist rule while themselves holding to Christian

moral principles, such as the Russian writers Anatoliy Levitin-Krasnov and Alexander Solzhenitsyn (Orthodox) and Georgi Vins (Baptist)) are very well aware of this fundamental difference in attitudes to 'dialogue' and the serious implications it has for *Détente* and for *Ospolitik*. The release of these men and others from communist régimes is hailed in western democracies as a victory for diplomacy or for the force of public opinion in the West, and perhaps it is. But to the Marxist such individuals are merely expendable pawns in the "compromise" or "collaboration" exercise in which they are engaged, for there is overwhelming evidence that the departure of individuals who have been victims of communist persecution and oppression *has in no way altered* the repressive laws or reduced the vigour of persecution still operating in the countries from which they came.

Dedicated Marxists are not going to be shamed into changing their philosophy by human persuaders, only God can touch the heart of an unbeliever. The true significance of Christian concern for those persecuted for their faith is that this concern is a channel of God's special love for each one who suffers, and it affirms the interdependence of all the members of the Body of Christ, who are bound together on earth in the vigil of Christian hope during the long hours of darkness before the dawn of Resurrection.

Compassion is not a sentimental feeling but an active ministry in its own right. Those who visit the terminally ill, or the bereaved in their grief, know that there is nothing they can 'do', yet the love of Christ constrains them to keep vigil with the one who suffers. So it is also with our persecuted brethren. We must do all that humanly can be done to alleviate their suffering, but our obligation to them goes much deeper, for in Christ our prayer of compassion helps to make fruitful their faithful witness to our Lord. This creative work of suffering, in which every Christian is called to share, is a profound mystery but we are fortunate today to have the assurance of history stretching back 2000 years, that what we read in the Gospel without fully comprehending—about the seed having to fall to the ground and die before it can become fruitful

in multiplying spiritual life in Christ and extending his Kingdom — has been exemplified many times through the fidelity of countless martyrs during periods when the Church was subjected to severe persecution.

Anyone who takes the trouble to study the history of our own era can observe that any amelioration which happens from time to time in the conditions of 'Human Rights' or in the circumstances in which the Churches are allowed to function in communist countries, comes about because of initiatives and pressures arising *inside* those countries, not from outside and this is why Cardinal Mindszenty protested against the Vatican's moves to deport him to Rome, saying that he would rather be re-arrested and imprisoned again, or executed, than to leave Hungary. This is why, when the Vatican finally ordered him to go to Rome in 1971 he went so unwillingly; this is why he refused Pope Paul's request (on November 1st, 1973) for his resignation as Archbishop of Esztergom (the primatial see of Hungary). The reasons set out in his reply to Pope Paul went unheeded and the see was declared vacant on December 18th, 1973. On January 7th, 1974 the Cardinal wrote again urgently begging Pope Paul to reconsider his decision, but to no avail. The policy of *Ostpolitik* by then was in full operation and on February 5th, 1974 the appointment of a successor to Cardinal Mindszenty was published simultaneously by the Vatican and Budapest. The president of the State Office for Ecclesiastical Affairs in Budapest declared: "The dismissal of József Mindszenty has been greeted with understanding by the thinking progressive public, both inside and outside ecclesiastical circles" and he assured the Holy See of his support.

Outside Vatican and communist circles, however, the announcement provoked bitter criticism. Cardinal Mindszenty himself made no public statement or protest. After staying briefly in Rome in 1971, following his removal from Hungary, the Cardinal had expressed the wish to live in Vienna, at a seminary founded by a former Primate of Hungary. He was already an old man of 80 but he worked long hours and travelled world-wide ministering to hundreds of thousands of Hungarian exiles. When the news came that the Pope had deposed him from his see in

Hungary, Cardinal Mindszenty said "My life's mission has not changed. There is plenty for me to do in the five continents, and I pray God that I may be enabled to accomplish my task . . .".

He died the following year, on May 6th, 1975, five weeks before the sixtieth anniversary of his ordination to the priesthood. Reading this biography one is left with a deep impression of the Cardinal's personal sanctity, forged in suffering and Christ-like in its sweetness and peace. His death marked the end of his earthly labours but the task he set out to accomplish has not been terminated by his death. His witness will live on to guide and strengthen the faithful until the Church's mission on earth is completed.

Those not closely associated with Cardinal Mindszenty's work have been too easily deceived by the propaganda which presents him as a 'political figure'. His mission was not political but pastoral. Nor did the Cardinal spend his time in planning programmes to adapt the Church's mission in response to prevailing secular fashions.

The former Bishop of Sandhurst has recorded (in another publication) a typical incident which occurred during the Cardinal's visit to Australia in December 1974. A vast gathering had been assembled in the Festival Hall in Melbourne to greet the Cardinal and to be addressed by him. Cardinal Mindszenty and the attendant dignitaries were collected by car from his residence to drive him to this reception but the Cardinal, having heard that several Hungarians were in prison in the Metropolitan jail where two of them were serving life sentences for murder, insisted that the car should stop first at the prison so that he could minister to them personally. Bishop Stewart recalls Cardinal Mindszenty's deep compassion for these unfortunate delinquents and how "one of the lifers produced a battered old prayer book and with tears streaming down his cheeks, poured out his sorrow to the Cardinal in whom he recognised the healing Christ, comforting his lost sheep".

* *Cardinal Mindszenty: Confessor and Martyr of Our Time*, by Jozsef Kozsi-Horvath. Translated from the German by Geoffrey Lawman. (Published jointly by Aid to the Church in Need (U.K.) and Augustine Publishing Co., Chumleigh, Devon 1979 pp. 145, paperback £1.00).

In this third article in his series on "The Christian Mind", Henry Edwards writes with great perception on Original Sin, the world and the Christian and the bogus freedom, which is thought of as release from a sense of guilt—something we need so much to recapture today.

The Christian Mind

AWARENESS OF EVIL

H. W. J. EDWARDS

"BETWEEN us and hell or heaven there is only life, the most fragile thing in the world". That is Pascal, of course (*Pensées*, 349). The Christian mind must betimes consider this vital fact. The universe is a battlefield between good and evil, with heaven and hell as two poles. And the orthodox Christian must take better account of what is called Original Sin than what I seem to have understood of recent writers, some of them Catholic. These men may well have been so upset by the powerful teaching of St. Augustine, who may indeed have been too severe here and there upon the doom of those dying in original sin (he was quite wrong about infants so dying), that they have proposed solutions which tend towards, if they do not indeed become, heresy. One has only to remind readers of certain dogmas brought into existence by the Second Synod of Orange and the decrees of Boniface II afterwards, to grasp the fact that man has a certain propensity to sin and that grace means exactly what it is supposed to mean, an utterly unmerited favour which, by the way, does in no way depend as some seem to think on possible good works in the future.

The Real Origin of Original Sin

It may be worth while considering the real origin of Original Sin (even at the risk of being reminded of Occam's Razor). I understand that orthodox Christians (I include here Christians not only within the Catholic citadel) are taught early that it all began with the temptation of Adam

and Eve by Satan in the Garden. This may not be so. The nature of the act which caused the Fall of Adam is not so easy to set out. It was essentially a refusal to obey when obedience must have been easy and desirable. At first, Adam's desires and his will were at one. A time must have come when he wanted rank and independence : in a word, he was guilty of pride, the greatest of sins. Adam wanted to see himself as his own principle rather than the principle God had implanted in him. The Adversary's temptation would not have led Adam astray had he not already begun to take delight in himself. This is the genesis of Humanism. This is the hidden evil which the external act merely uncovered. That is why Augustine insisted that Original Sin was a result of man's freedom of choice and should, therefore, be imputed primarily to his will—"because it was through free choice that he abandoned God, he was visited with God's just judgement" (*de Corruptione et Gratia*).

Darkening of the Intellect and Disorder of the Will

I am very well aware that one school among good Catholics regards Original Sin merely as a privation of supernatural good or at least appears to minimise the darkening of the intellect and the disorder of the will. Much as I revere the theology of the Byzantine and other oriental Fathers, I cannot help noticing their comparative indulgence towards mankind in this respect, though there must have been a time when they of the East would have had to accept the decrees of Boniface II and other dogmas of the Church on this subject and on Grace centuries before the schism. I am answered by some of them that the Pelagian controversy was almost entirely an affair of the West so that they hold a certain indifference towards it much as they do about the controversy in the West on transubstantiation.

Again, our western Christian tradition has been so impaired by conflicts with Lutherans, Calvinists and Jansenists, all of whom in some way exaggerated or travestied Catholic doctrine on this head, that many who now explore the matter become a little frightened lest anything they may utter may smell of the faggot. Newman (I hope I have not mentioned this before) was right in urging that a given

Gospel truth should not be emphasised at one given time, but emphasised in another: it is part of his theory of economy. Today is the accepted time for an emphasis upon asserting the existence of the wound caused by Original Sin and the need for actual grace in as powerful a sense as was ever used by SS Paul and Augustine.

The World and the Christian

Perhaps the expression—the World, the Flesh and the Devil, is badly framed. The flesh should come first, flesh in the sense so often used in Scripture as including the carnal mind. The Devil comes next in time. The world comes most certainly last, for it would have taken some time before anything we know of as the world in the bad sense would have been the temptation it swiftly became. On the other hand, it is the world in this bad sense which Christians especially confront today. We must be sensitive to all that this implies. This “world” is the thing ruled over by the Powers-that-Be; if you like, the several “establishments”. The world has its spokesmen who spend some time in trying to persuade us that these establishments do not exist. In much the same way clever men tell us to forget about Satan and his bad angels. I dare say that concupiscence has been explained away by third-rate students of psychology. Christians refuse to admit the pleas of non-existence or innocence.

I am well known in my own land as a high Tory; but I refuse to be courted by Conservatives whose politics are as damnably materialistic as those of the Centre, the Left and the Left-Left. The luxury of the merely rich invites envy, sin invites sin. I shall not, then, be accused of pandering to Conservatives if I declare that much of the demand for wage rises and the like has Envy at the source. Of course, the concept of the trade union is sound. But the corruption of the best is the worst and it is licit for a Christian (even if a trade unionist) soberly to ask whether the T.U.C. is acting as a quasi-state force on behalf of those who want more for the sake of wanting more cupidity.

Positive Laws and the Law of God

In one important respect the lack of a Christian mind is leading—has already led—to serious consequences. I mean

the widespread confusion between positive (state-enacted or UN or EEC) law and the law of God. It happens that some grave sins are illegal acts; but one has only to know that so "liberal" a nation-State as Sweden permits incest and that, via the Wolfenden report, sodomy is not illegal in the U.K. if done in private by consenting adults, to grasp the radical difference between crime and sin. The Christian mind must bring to bear upon the human scene moral criteria, which are radically different from those of our "liberal" society in which many decent people think that adultery is wrong, but can be made right by divorce and "re-marriage". It has constantly to act upon the assumption that acts of pride may be as grave as rape or murder. A cunning man may live a life of devilish pride and pass as a most respectable citizen, rising perhaps to some eminence. The Christian mind must notice that in the great parable of the sheep and the goats respectable people who go to church or chapel and who have been known for their philanthropy, mark ye, are among the goats. Newman got into great trouble with respectable people because he thought a poor Italian woman who had committed a very petty theft might be more righteous than many well-thought-of, top English women.

Two Idolatries

It is not fortuitous that in divers places in Holy Scripture the sins of covetousness and fornication are juxtaposed. In the Testament of the Old Covenant the prophets linked adultery with idolatry and we ought to know why. The Testament of the New Covenant links fornication and covetousness together by a less easy to understand connection, e.g. Hebrews 13, 5 and Collossians 3, 5. They are linked chiefly because both are idolatry in some sense: there is an inordinate affection for sexual gratification or for a means to gain power. Indeed, according to one school of psychologists, it is a lust for power—"ye shall be as gods"—which exploits the sexual act. The sin of covetousness is most probably harder to detect today than in days when some miser would croon over his bag of gold. "Money" is that quite abstract thing about which Spengler wrote at the close of his *Decline of the West*. It seems to be as distant from gold sovereigns as nuclear fission is from dynamite. As the

object is so less palpable, hardly touching the senses, the sin seems to belong almost exclusively to the intellect in the case of those who have great bank books. Yet the man riddled with Marxism, who declares against production for profit may be as covetous as some capitalist. It is not the degree which is here in question. A Catholic may be covetous who wants, say, £500, and wants it so much that he will miss Sunday Mass so as to get it; that two sins are committed is irrelevant.

I fear that I never knew what was the exact heresy called Americanism, which a Pope attacked a fairly long time ago. But I always seem to think of the word whenever I recall a letter and a picture postcard of the sender's own church in the U.S.A. True, the sender was quite artless in congratulating himself and the parish in which he lived because of the size, beauty and opulence of the church building, the thriving sodalities, the mounting collections, the real estate and the Future to which all in the parish looked with what I regard as an American idea of Hope. The tragedy is (for the evil flourishes in many parts) that there seems to be in all this no sense of guilt.

Need for a Sense of Guilt

A close relative sends me yearly the Order of Service of the Women's World Day of Prayer. This Organisation has representatives of various Christian groups and of the Catholic Church. In 1980, the Order which had as its theme, "Responsible Freedom", seemed almost irreproachable. Yet, on the first page I read: "Freedom means release from selfishness, *from the sense of guilt*, from sin, and from fear which strangles human beings". What am I to understand of this freedom which frees me from a sense of guilt? In one sense, of course, it is a weakness attending the scrupulous that he feels a sense of guilt when there is no sin. It is gracious kindness which causes a sinner to know his sins have been forgiven. But leave me to have a sense of guilt: or I may go after Demas, if I have escaped the Town called Morality. May some brave one call for a bidding prayer, which would call upon God to bring the sense of guilt to millions upon millions of people who have heard and who have rejected the Gospel of the Grace of God.

This report has been compiled by Father Michael Clifton, a parish priest of Southwark Diocese, on behalf of several delegates loyal to the Church's teaching but worried by many of the resolutions passed at the National Pastoral Congress held at Liverpool in May of this year, 1980.

The Congress : A Minority Report

FATHER MICHAEL CLIFTON AND OTHERS

PREFACE

IN presenting a minority report we do not wish to condemn all the excellent work that was produced at the Congress. For instance the preamble to the Report in Sector A on Christian Stewardship and the Youth Report in the Education Sector. No one could disagree with the sentiments expressed here. The role of the laity in the Church of today as expressed by the 2nd Vatican Council is very well put in the statement prepared by Sector B. However, we do feel that several resolutions were passed which were totally unsatisfactory. We also feel that the Congress was not genuinely representative of Catholic laity or priesthood. The choice of delegates inevitably meant a preponderance of one particular viewpoint. What seemed like the general apathy about the Congress was a manifestation of the general distrust of the whole idea and a reflection of the laity's traditional reliance on the Holy Father and the Bishops for leadership. So many people considered the Congress would be a waste of time and this indifference showed itself in the generally poor attendance at the discussion groups arranged beforehand and at the special services of preparation.

Although the tone of the Sector reports was in general muted, the resolutions passed in each Sector showed that the general aim was towards the creation of a new type of

Church based on man's wants instead of God's wishes. Thus there is little or no mention of the fact basic to our faith that Christ died and rose again to save us from sin and death and showed us the way to eternal life in heaven. That this saving action of Christ was occasioned by the Original Sin of our first parents who thereby lost that sharing in the life of God that we call Sanctifying Grace, and so became liable to (actual) sin and death. That this loss is transmitted to all of us at our very conception by the process of generation.

Instead of basing the reports on a beginning like this, there is constant but vague reference to prayer, but mainly in "prayer groups" which are now seen to be a new essential of our faith. Yet it is individual prayer which is really vital for our spiritual lives and not some kind of group dynamic experience. We are told to model our lives on Christ and this of course is absolutely true, but the real significance of Christ's death is totally overlooked here. In fact the only references to sin and the Sacrament of Penance came in repeated calls for an extension of general absolution which would in effect destroy the Sacrament altogether.

Instead of consideration of man's eternal destiny and the need to remember we are judged as individuals, there is an overinsistence running through the reports on "community" and the "caring, sharing (Co-op?) Church". While we fully recognise that we do not live our lives in isolation from our fellow human beings, it must not be overlooked that many excellent Catholics do not wish to join in so-called community activities or small prayer groups and prefer to attend Mass as part of a large congregation rather than an intimate small gathering.

The new model of the Church suggested by the Congress reports demands the setting up of a whole new bureaucratic structure with further commissions and councils to deal with everything from liturgy to one-parent families and racial justice. We feel that the introduction of a whole set of new structures mainly aimed at activities which are basically directed to the service of man's wants, alters the whole basis of our faith as the service of God. We think that a similar state of affairs to that pertaining in Holland could arise if many of the resolutions proposed here were adopted.

INTRODUCTION TO THE CRITICISMS

The reports constantly speak of the need to study the teachings and "spirit" of Vatican II. We are told they have not been properly adopted in this country. We are told there should be a big programme of "in-service" training for Bishops, Priests and laity alike. However, it is never made clear exactly what ground would be covered in these programmes, though every Sector recommends them. The only matter about the programmes that is clear is that they are based on an assumption that the role of the laity has been widely misunderstood by priests and that steps must be taken to correct this. The reports constantly cry out that the laity must take an active role in the decision making processes of the Church at every level. For some this seems to mean the creation of new doctrinal teaching.

The "Spirit" of Vatican II is very vague. Many have considered that this mysterious "spirit" has been responsible for so many of the divisions that have affected Catholics both here and abroad. The "spirit" may then be described as the extraction of certain statements from the council documents out of context and without reference to the ordinary teaching of the Church and then using these statements to justify strange theological deviations from the Church's magisterium. Thus the "common priesthood of the laity" is often taken to whittle away the real distinction between this type of priesthood and that of the ordained ministry of priests.

The detailed criticisms which follow will be levelled at those resolutions which affect the magisterium, usually by calling for some kind of change in the Church's teaching, and then those resolutions which we think are either dangerous or impractical for various reasons but which do not affect the magisterium directly.

RESOLUTIONS AFFECTING THE MAGISTERIUM

Sector A

This Sector called for a wide extension of the practice of intercommunion particularly for the spouses of a mixed wedding. It has been pointed out time and again that intercommunion is the sign of unity and not the means towards

it. The conditions under which a non-Catholic may receive Holy Communion in our Churches are clearly laid down and most people would consider they could never apply in this country. Furthermore, the quotation from the Decrees on Ecumenism, "The grace to be won sometimes recommends it", does not refer explicitly to sharing in the Eucharist but to "communicatio in Sacris" in general.

We humbly submit that your Lordships should restate again the existing rules on this matter.

The first resolution of the Unity group thanked theologians for the progress made towards unity over the last 15 years. This certainly referred to the work of the A.R.C.I.C. group and we would therefore ask the Bishops if it is possible for the examination of their reports to be expedited so that it could be shown that they are not acceptable as a true basis for Unity.

Another resolution called for the Catholic Church to become (in this country) a full member of the British Council of Churches. This body holds a variety of different dogmatic and moral views and we feel that our existing status as observers should be maintained and not extended.

Several resolutions in nearly every sector called for the maximum involvement of the laity in the preparation and celebration of the liturgy. It was clear from a discussion in Sector A that there was a call for women altar servers to be accepted. Rome has always forbidden this and we feel that, at the very least, it would detract from vocations to the priesthood. Furthermore, the degree and involvement of the laity at Mass is already clearly laid down. The tone of the resolutions seems to suggest that the laity seek to dictate to the priest how to say Mass.

There was much talk in each sector on "Lay ministries". We understand that the Vatican documents only use this expression where a layman is specially commissioned as, say, a catechist or extraordinary minister of Holy Communion. We feel therefore uneasy about the use of this term so frequently in the reports. We agree lay people should use their gifts in the service of the Church. "Ministries" again suggests the claiming of almost priestly powers.

OTHER POINTS AFFECTING THE MAGISTERIUM

From Other Sectors

Several sectors suggested a greater use of the rite of General Absolution without individual confession. The norms were laid down many years ago but practice varies widely over the country. We feel that if this rite was widely adopted it would quickly lead to the complete end of individual confessions. We therefore ask for clarification on when this rite may be used.

Sector B passed a resolution calling for priests to attend extended sessions of in-service training even to the possibility of leaving their parishes without Sunday Masses. We feel that this extraordinary suggestion was proposed with a view to experimenting with the idea of "Lay liturgies" where there is a shortage of priests. We do not think there is that degree of shortage in this country. We do not see the need for extended in-service training either.

As might have been expected there was a call for further study to be made into the possibility of ordaining women as priests. The Pope has explicitly ruled this out. We would like to see a firm statement on this point.

In Sector C the Topic group on Marriage and Family seemed to go far beyond their mandate and proposed a complete new theology of sexual intercourse. Coming near to blasphemy they elevated the status of intercourse to that of a sacrament in stating that the couple make Christ present to each other in this way. However, the whole exercise seemed to be a careful move to cover up the point that, if intercourse could be regarded as a good in itself without reference to the possible consequences (conception), then the teaching of *Humanae Vitae* on contraception could be quietly dropped. We would humbly suggest to your Lordship's that they reaffirm their loyalty to the Papal teaching in *Humanae Vitae* and put an end to efforts currently being made to shelve the teachings contained in this statement banning artificial methods of birth control.

In the same Sector we noted that a recommendation was made that divorced and then re-married Catholics should be re-admitted to the Sacraments. We fully recognise the difficulty that such Catholics must live under, but any alteration here would simply nullify Christ's teaching on the unity and indissolubility of marriage.

OTHER WORRYING RESOLUTIONS

The Liturgy group in Sector A backed up by various resolutions from other sectors resolved to ask for the greatest possible variety in the celebration of the Eucharist to meet the needs of different groups, children, youth, ethnic groups etc. We feel that to introduce wide variety into the way of celebrating Mass will in fact lead to a divisive spirit in the parishes. Already, children used to so-called "Children's Masses" complain that the Sunday Mass is dull and boring and are refusing to attend.

Following the almost unanimous vote on this point in Sector A members of the Latin Mass Society were rightly disappointed when they were not allowed to put their proposition to the whole sector conference calling for the old rite of Mass to co-exist with the new rite.

The liturgy group also called for the reception of Holy Communion under both kinds to become the norm, with many extra lay ministers being commissioned. We feel the existing norms are sufficient and that the many abuses that have crept in should be corrected. We feel too that the original reasons why communion under both kinds was forbidden in the first place are still valid and the creation of an army of special ministers will again weaken the position of the ordained ministry.

We would like to see a statement from your Lordships on exactly who is entitled to receive the Sacrament of the Sick and how often in the same illness. There are large variations in practice current in this country at the moment. We also call for further clarification on the age at which Confirmation should be administered.

The group dealing with the local Church resolved that parishes should be broken down into small neighbourhood or interest groups. We feel there are many dangers in such a breakdown and the creation of basic Christian Communities could very easily lead to still more divisions among the laity.

The Church unity group resolved that the construction of any "separate plant" (Churches, Halls, Schools) should not go ahead without consulting other Churches because such construction "impeded progress to unity by institutionalis-

ing our decisions". Surely we *are* an Institution—the One True Church—and we hardly need to consult on such essential matters.

We feel too that ecumenical covenants may have value between a particular set of clergy, but that any changes of personnel should automatically bring such covenants to a halt pending new decisions by the new group of clergy.

There were many excellent points raised, notably in the education Sector and the definition of the role of the Laity, in Sector B. However, this same sector then claimed to arrogate almost full power for the laity. "We urge the hierarchy to listen to and trust our own distinctive insights and experiences when they are drawing up statements and directives on social and moral issues. . . etc". Our group feels that this is an attempt to take over the authority of the Bishops in their role of teachers of the faith.

FINAL STATEMENT

We do not wish to deny that much useful work went on at Liverpool and that many excellent ideas were put forward and that most of the delegates were very sincere people. However we feel that the resolutions we have referred to here, if implemented, could do untold harm to the Church in this country.

On going to press we have just received news of the statement from Rome on the way that Holy Mass should be celebrated. In several ways this contradicts the resolutions proposed by the liturgy sector. We hope that due note will be taken. Also we would like to express our strong support for Mrs. Bowman's report on the Congress, particularly noting that the abortion issue was relegated to a very small corner instead of a firm statement being made. Are Catholics now afraid to speak up on this subject? What happens when the same political mafia try and push through a bill to legalise euthanasia? Will the Church be ready to face them?

Reverend George H. Duggan, S.M., is a New Zealander. After earning his S.T.D. at the Angelicum in Rome, he taught philosophy for fifteen years at the Marist seminary, Greenmeadows, and then was rector in turn of a university hall of residence and Marist tertianship. Father Duggan is the author of "Evolution and Philosophy" (1949), "Hans Küng and Reunion" (1964), and "Teilhardism and the Faith" (1968). He is now an assistant in the parish of St. Mary's, Wang-anui. Acknowledgements to the *Homiletic and Pastoral Review*.

Life after Death

REV. GEORGE H. DUGGAN

THE Letter on certain questions concerning eschatology which the Sacred Congregation for the Doctrine of the Faith addressed to all the Bishops of the world is a very interesting document. Written to counteract the spread of erroneous opinions regarding life after death;¹ it does little more than restate, under seven heads, the teaching of the New Testament and Catholic Tradition regarding life everlasting, the truth in which we profess our faith in the final article of the Creed. What is novel about the Letter is that it refrains from detailed argument in support of the truths which it proclaims. It mentions, but only in a general way, two New Testament texts (1 Cor. 15; Heb. 11:1), does not cite any earlier documents of the Magisterium and does not engage in philosophical argument. Why has the Sacred Congregation taken this line? The most likely explanation is that it did not wish to open the door to subtle historicist argument about the Scriptural and Conciliar texts or Existentialist objections to the notion of a disembodied spirit, all of which would serve only to confuse the issue.

It has been said by a number of modern theologians² that the doctrine of the immortality of the human soul was borrowed by Christian thinkers from Greek philos-

ophy and is incompatible with the Hebrew understanding of man, which is derived from divine revelation and is expressed in Holy Writ. In this view of the matter, which reflects a Lutheran distrust of reason, there are several fallacies. In the first place, it identifies Greek philosophy, which is a welter of conflicting views, with Platonism, and secondly, it supposes that the Hebrews, who, as C. H. Dodd has remarked, lacked an adequate philosophy, had nothing to learn from Greek philosophy. To put the matter in perspective, we shall set out briefly the views of some representative Greek philosophers, comparing these with the teaching of Holy Scripture and referring as we proceed to authoritative statements of the Magisterium on the matter under discussion.

Man is body and soul

Democritus (460-370) and Epicurus (341-270) held that the human being is simply an agglomeration of atoms, atoms of finer texture constituting the soul and coarser atoms the body; at death this complex structure disintegrates, and nothing remains of the individual man but the atoms, which are then available for recomposition into other agglomerations. The Book of Wisdom in a striking passage puts in the mouth of the wicked this Epicurean philosophy: "We are born of nothing and after this we shall be as if we had not been: for the breath in our nostrils is smoke, and speech is a spark to move our heart. Which being put out, our body shall be ashes, and our spirit be poured abroad as soft air, and our life shall pass away as the trace of a cloud and shall be dispersed as a mist that is driven away by the beams of the sun and overpowered with the heat thereof" (Wisd. of Sol. 2:2-3).

Plato (427-347) taught that the human soul is a complete entity, which exists in another world before dwelling in the body and at death returns to the world from which it came. Wordsworth echoes Plato's teaching when in his *Ode on the Intimations of Immortality in Childhood* he speaks of our coming from God "not in entire forgetfulness". This doctrine of the pre-existence of the human soul was taken up by Origen, and condemned by Pope Vigilius in 543 as erroneous;³ and as Gilson has pointed

out, Plato's idea of the soul as a complete entity which dwells temporarily in the body is incompatible with Christian faith in the resurrection of the body⁴.

Aristotle (384-322) rejected Plato's view that man consists of two quite distinct entities. For him, soul and body are so united in man as to form one being. Hence the human soul begins to exist as part of the human composite when man comes into being. Its union with the body, far from being unnatural, is demanded by nature, since man depends for his intellectual development on the functioning of the bodily senses. In thus asserting the essential unity of the human composite, Aristotle is fully in line with the biblical conception of man, which the Council of Vienne in 1311 expressed in technical language when it defined that the substance of the rational soul is truly, *per se*, and essentially the form of the human body i.e. the soul and body are so united in man as to form a single substance⁵.

Most believe in after-life

Scholars dispute whether Aristotle regarded the individual human soul as immortal, but most think he did not. This was certainly the view of some Medieval and Renaissance disciples of Aristotle, the Averroists. Taking their cue from Averroes (1126-1198), an Arab commentator on Aristotle, they held that whatever Aristotle taught must be true. Since Aristotle denied that the human soul is immortal, they maintained that as philosophers they must follow suit, even though as Christians they accepted the Church's teaching on immortality. Their views were condemned as heretical in 1513 by the Fifth Lateran Council, which declared that the rational or intellective soul is not only truly, *per se*, and essentially the form of the human body as the Council of Vienne taught, it is also immortal⁶.

Man, the human composite, like every other organism, is mortal: "It is appointed unto man once to die" (Heb. 9:27). But death is not the end. There is a life beyond the grave. This is the verdict of men of every culture, primitive or civilized. To the universality of this belief among primitive peoples Sir James Frazer bears witness.

"It is impossible", he writes, "not to be struck by the strength, and perhaps we may say the universality of the natural belief in immortality among the savage races of mankind. With them a life after death is not a matter of speculation or conjecture, or hope and fear; it is a practical certainty, which the individual as little dreams of doubting as he doubts the reality of his conscious existence". What he says of the man of primitive cultures is true also of civilized man. Thus for example we have the Egyptian *Book of the Dead*, in which Osiris and the other gods are depicted as weighing in the balance a man's good deeds and bad and pronouncing judgement accordingly on the departed spirit. To quote Frazer again: "The question whether our conscious personality survives after death has been answered by almost all races in the affirmative. On this point, sceptical or agnostic peoples are nearly, if not wholly unknown".

For the Hebrews the abode of the dead was Sheol. During their long stay in Egypt they would surely have picked up some ideas from their hosts as they did later in Babylonia, but in the early days their ideas were vague and hesitant, though they were in no doubt that there is some sort of future life⁸. As the centuries went by, their thought evolved, and in the second century before Christ, some of them at least had a well developed doctrine of immortality, which we find in the Book of Wisdom. The Jews, it is true, excluded this book from the list of inspired writings when they drew up their canon about 90 A.D., but the Church has always regarded it as the inspired word of God.

When we turn to the New Testament, we find abundant evidence testifying to the existence of a future life. Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, Christ declared, are still alive (Matt. 22:32); the rich man is buried in hell (Luke 16:22); the penitent thief will that very day be with Christ in paradise (Luke 23:43). St. Peter tells us that Christ after his death preached to those spirits that were in prison (1 Pet. 3:19). St. Paul, who longs to be dissolved and to be with Christ (Phil. 1:23), writes that "If our hope in Christ has been for this life only, we are the most unfortunate of all people" (1 Cor. 15:19).

What happens to the disembodied spirit after death? We have no detailed information, and the Sacred Congregation warns us to beware of arbitrary imaginative representations. When Dante describes hell, purgatory, and heaven in his *Divine Comedy*, he must, as a poet, make use of imaginative representations, but there is no place for these in catechesis or the preaching of the word. There we must content ourselves with the teaching of the Magisterium that at death the soul is judged and its fate depends on whether or not it is in the grace of God at death. If it is in grace and has no sins to expiate, it is admitted at once to the vision of God, as Pope Benedict XII authoritatively taught in 1336⁹. 'If it has some sins to expiate, it will have to be purified for a time in Purgatory, as the Council of Trent defined in 1547¹⁰. If it is in the state of mortal sin, it will be condemned to the punishment of hell, and this punishment will be eternal, as Pope Vigilius taught in 543 when he condemned Origen's theory that all the lost will eventually be saved¹¹.

Life is everlasting

For St. Thomas, the immortality of the human soul is a truth which can be proved conclusively by philosophical arguments¹². What these arguments do is to bring into sharper focus the insights which the generality of men share concerning the human condition. As the Second Vatican Council, which has no hesitation in speaking of the soul of man, says: "When man recognizes in himself a spiritual and immortal soul, he is not being led astray by false imaginings that are merely due to physical or social causes. On the contrary, he grasps what is profoundly true in this matter¹³". Men in general are aware, however obscurely, that in man there is a spiritual element which differentiates him from the lower creation. That is why they know there is a world of difference between killing a sheep and killing a man. They are aware, too, that man is subject to a moral law, for which the sanctions available in this life are inadequate. In his book *A Rumour of Angels* Peter Berger argues persuasively that for some crimes our moral sense demands the retribution of damnation¹⁴. The "categorical imperative" which imposes

moral endeavour as a duty makes sense only if there is a future life in which virtue is rewarded and vice punished. If death ended all, the only sensible policy would be the *Carpe diem* of Horace—to seize what passing joys this life has to offer while they are still within our grasp. This policy, the policy of the wicked who are worldly-wise, is set out at length in the Book of Wisdom (Wisd. of Sol. 2:1-11) and was summed up by St. Paul: “Let us eat and drink, for tomorrow we shall die” (1 Cor. 15:32).

The Sacred Congregation therefore does no more than draw our attention to an obvious truth when it stresses the importance of this final article of the Creed: “I believe in life everlasting”.

1. Cr. *The New Catechism (the Dutch Catechism)* p. 471, where personal survival is reduced to the warmth and light by which we influence those who are left behind.
2. For example, O. Cullmann, K. Barth.
3. Denzinger, *Enchiridion Symbolorum*, ed. 18-20, n. 211.
4. Cf. *The Spirit of Medieval Philosophy*, ch. IX: “Christian Anthropology”.
5. Denzinger, *op. cit.*, n. 481.
6. Denzinger, *op. cit.*, n. 738.
7. *The Belief in Immortality*, Vol. 1, pp. 468, 33. Quoted in Doolan, A., *Philosophy for the Layman*, Dublin, 1944, pp. 164-5.
8. Cf. Sutcliffe, E. F., *The Old Testament and the Future Life*, London, 1947.
9. Denzinger, *op. cit.*, n. 530.
10. Denzinger, *op. cit.*, n. 840.
11. Denzinger, *op. cit.*, n. 211.
12. Cf. *Summa Theologiae*, I, q. 75.
13. *Pastoral Constitution on the Church in the Modern World*, n. 14.
14. *A Rumour of Angels*, Penguin Books, London 1971, pp. 84-89.

Ride your life
Between the stirrup
And the ground:
Trust in Christ.

—Frank Rickards

This third and concluding part of the Joint Pastoral of the late Archbishop Romero of San Salvador and Bishop Arturo Damas of Santiago de Maria, now Administrator of the Archdiocese, concerns itself importantly with the judgment of the Church on violence in its different manifestations and applies the judgment to conditions prevailing in San Salvador. Readers are reminded that copies of this Joint Pastoral are obtainable from the Catholic Institute for International Relations, 1, Cambridge Terrace, London NW1 4JL, United Kingdom. We are indebted to the CIIR for permission to reproduce the Joint Pastoral.

The Church, Political Organization and Violence

3: JUDGEMENT OF THE CHURCH ON VIOLENCE *

The Reason for this Section and its Structure

IN connection with the subject of 'popular organisations', the problem of violence arises spontaneously since, in the efforts of these groups to obtain their social, political and economic aims, violence is often regarded as a suitable means. That is why our pastoral mission now obliges us to offer these principles from the Church's moral teaching to guide the thinking of our communities.

We shall consider the following points:

1. Different sorts of violence;
2. The Church's moral judgement on violence;
3. Its application to the situation in El Salvador.

* Since this Pastoral Letter was written in 1978 the social and political situation in El Salvador has changed very considerably (see Introduction) and this must be borne in mind by the reader.

Our Reality and Our Ideal

How painful it is to have to offer to our Divine Saviour, together with the hopeful prayers of His people gathered together in the light of His Transfiguration, the horrifying spectacle of the situation in our country, stained as it is with so much blood, so many attacks on the dignity, the liberty, and even on the lives of our citizens. We live, nationally, in an explosive situation, heavy with the fruits of violence. We often see demonstrations ending with the shedding of the blood of the demonstrators and sometimes even of members of the security forces. In many places recently, especially in the countryside, there have been violent conflicts, sometimes on the scale of a military operation, extending over wide areas. There are many households which grieve for the victims of kidnappings, murder, threats, criminal arson and so on.

In this situation, where consciences can lose all sensitivity, we have to go on repeating, even if we are a voice crying in the wilderness, "no to violence, yes to peace".

The Church is quite clear about this ideal, no matter how much calumny and persecution may have tried to distort its message: "We strongly reaffirm our faith in the fruitfulness of peace"—this was the voice of the Latin American episcopate at Medellin—"that is our Christian ideal . . . we place no trust in violence" (Medellin, *Peace*, 15, 19).

Today, in this pastoral letter, we are also fulfilling the final charge laid upon us by Paul VI at the audience during our *ad limina* visit of 21 June 1978. He urged us to show pastoral solidarity with our people. He mentioned their efforts to obtain justice and charged us to guide them in the path of a just peace and to help them avoid the easy temptation of violence and hatred.

1. Different Sorts of Violence

However, if it is easy enough to put forward the ideal of peace, it is much less easy to deal with the reality of violence which, historically, seems inevitable so long as its true causes are not eliminated. Normally speaking, and save in pathological cases, violence is no part of man's make-up. People do not fulfill themselves by humiliating, harming, kidnapping, torturing or killing others. Violence

has other roots which have to be exposed. To do that we must analyse the different sorts of violence along the lines suggested by the bishops of Latin America at Medellin.

a) *Institutional violence*

The most acute form in which violence appears on our continent and in our own country is what the bishops of Medellin called "institutionalised violence" (Medellin, *Peace*, 16). This is the product of an unjust situation in which the majority of men and women and, above all, the children in our country find themselves deprived of the necessities of life.

This violence finds its expression in the structure and daily functioning of a socio-economic and political system which accepts it as normal and usual that progress is impossible unless the majority of the people are used as a productive force under the management of a privileged minority. Historically we come across this sort of violence whenever the institutional structures of society operate to the benefit of a minority or systematically discriminate against groups or individuals who defend the true common good.

Those responsible for this institutionalisation of violence, as they are responsible for the international structures which cause it, are those who monopolise economic power instead of sharing it, "those who defend themselves using violent means; and all those who do not work for justice by the means at their disposal, and remain passive for fear of the risks they might run or the personal sacrifices they might have to make, risks and sacrifices involved in any bold and really efficacious action" (Medellin, *Peace*, 17-18). This institutionalised violence is firmly and dramatically established in our country.

b) *The State's repressive violence*

Alongside institutionalised violence there frequently arises repressive violence, that is to say the use of violence by the state's security forces to the extent that the state tries to contain the aspirations of the majority, violently crushing any signs of protest against the injustices we have mentioned.

This is a real form of violence. It is unjust because through it, the State, acting from above and with all its institutional power, defends the survival of the present socio-economic and political system. It thus prevents the people having any real chance of using their fundamental right to self-government—the people being the ultimate source of political power—to find a new institutional road towards justice.

c) *Seditious or terrorist violence*

There is another dangerous kind of violence, which some call 'revolutionary' but which we prefer to describe as sedition or terrorism, for the word 'revolutionary' does not always have the pejorative sense we intend here. We are talking of that violence which Paul VI called "the explosive revolutions of desperation" (Bogota, 23/8/68, quoted in Medellin, *Peace*, 17). This violence is usually organised and attempted in the form of guerilla warfare or terrorism and is wrongly thought of as the final and only effective way to change the social situation. It is a violence which produces and provokes useless and unjustifiable bloodshed, abandons society to explosive tensions which are beyond the control of reason and it despises in principle any form of dialogue as a possible means of solving social conflicts.

d) *Spontaneous violence*

We call violence spontaneous when it is an immediate, not a calculated or organised, reaction by groups or individuals when they are violently attacked in the exercise of their own legitimate rights in protests, demonstrations, just strikes and so on. In being spontaneous and not deliberately sought, this form of violence is marked by desperation and improvisation and so cannot be an effective way of securing rights or bringing just solutions to conflicts.

e) *Violence as a legitimate defence*

Violence can also be used in legitimate self-defence, when a group or an individual repels by force the unjust aggression to which they have been subjected. This violence seeks to neutralise, or at least to bring under effective control—not necessarily to destroy—an imminent, serious and unjust threat.

f) *The violence of non-violence*

To complete this classification of violence it is only right to include the power of non-violence, which today clearly has its own eager students and followers. The Gospel's advice to turn the other cheek to an unjust aggressor, far from being passivity and cowardice, is evidence of great moral strength which leaves the aggressor morally defeated and humiliated. "The Christian is able to fight, but he prefers peace to war" was what Medellin said about this moral force of non-violence (Medellin, *Peace*, 15).

2. *The Church's Moral Judgement on Violence*

While we were making our *ad Limina* visit, the *Osservatore Romano*, the semi-official mouthpiece of the Holy See, published a brave article called 'The Democratic State and Violence' (23.6.78). We believe it would be helpful to make use of its arguments to bring up to date the Church's traditional teaching on violence, of which the bishops at Medellin also spoke.

"Recourse to violence" remarked the paper, "is a sad habit of human kind, and is one of the most obvious signs both of the imperfection which is part of man anywhere and under any system and also of the constant need to start again from the beginning the work of personal perfections and of social improvement to contain and control the instincts which keep on reappearing in man and lead to the struggle of man against man".

However, despite the fact that the Church thinks of any sort of violence as a sign "of the imperfection which is part of man" and despite the fact that it constantly emphasises its preference and its love for the ideal of peace, the Church makes a different judgement on each sort of violence. That judgement can range from prohibition and condemnation to acceptance in certain conditions. We are now going to list some moral principles which should bind the conscience of any honourable man :

- a) The Church has always condemned violence pursued for its own sake, or wrongly used against any human right, or used as the first and only method to defend and advance a human right. Evil may not be done to promote good.

- b) The Church allows violence in legitimate defence, but under the following conditions (i) that the defence does not exceed the degree of unjust aggression (for example, if one can perfectly adequately defend oneself with one's hands, then it is wrong to fire at the aggressor); (ii) that the recourse to proportionate violence takes place only after all peaceful means have been exhausted; and (iii) that a violent defence should not bring about a greater evil than that which is being visited, for example, a greater violence, a greater injustice.
- c) Because it is the root of greater evils, the Church has condemned institutionalised violence, repressive violence by government, terrorist violence and any sort of violence which is likely to provoke further violence in legitimate self-defence.
- d) Medellín's document of Peace, quoting text from Paul VI's encyclical, *Populorum Progressio*, mentions the legitimacy of "insurrection" in the very exceptional circumstances of a "clear and lengthy tyranny which seriously attacks the fundamental human rights of individuals and dangerously damages the common good of the country, whether its source is a person, or structures which are evidently unjust". It immediately goes on, however, to warn of the danger of occasioning, through the insurrection, "new violence, . . . new injustices . . . and new destruction"—all of which would justify a condemnation of the insurrection.
- e) For this reason too the Church has taught — and the present situation gives tragic relevance to this teaching — that a government ought to use all its moral and coercive power to guarantee a truly democratic State, one based on a just economic order, in which justice, peace, and the exercise of every citizen's fundamental rights are defended. So the government ought to strive to make "increasingly hypothetical and unreal the situation in which recourse to force by some individuals or groups can be justified by the existence of a tyrannical regime in which the laws, the institutions and the government, instead of recognising and promoting fundamental liberties and the other rights of man, tread them underfoot, reducing their citizens to the condition of an

oppressed people" (*L'Osservatore Romano*, op cit.).

- f) The Church prefers the constructive energy of non-violence: "The Christian is a man of peace, and is not embarrassed by this fact. He is not simply a pacifist, because he is capable of fighting, but he prefers peace to war. He knows that sudden and violent changes in structures will be mistaken, ineffective in themselves and certainly not in accordance with the dignity of the people" (Medellin, *Peace*, 25).

3. *Application to the Situation in El Salvador*

Let us select from this general teaching of the Church about violence these brief applications and guidelines for the situation in our dioceses.

a) *To believe in peace*

We proclaim the supremacy of our faith in peace and we appeal to everyone to make determined efforts to secure it. We cannot place all our trust in violent methods if we are true Christians or even just honourable men.

b) *To work for justice*

The peace in which we believe is, however, the fruit of justice: 'opus iustitiae pax'. As a simple analysis of our structures shows and as history confirms, violent conflicts will not disappear until the underlying causes disappear. To that extent, as long as the causes of our present distress persist, and as long as the powerful minority persist in their intransigence and refuse to accept even the smallest changes, then there will be renewed outbreaks of violence. If there is further use of repressive violence, that will unhappily do nothing more than increase the conflict and make less hypothetical and more real the situation in which recourse to force, as a legitimate defence, can be justified.

We therefore regard as the most urgent task the establishment of social justice.

c) *Reject the cult of violence*

This cult of violence, which becomes almost a mystique or religion among individuals or groups is doing immeasurable harm to our people. They preach violence as the sole source of justice and they propound and practise it as

a method to bring justice to this country. This pathological mentality makes it impossible to check the spiral of violence and it contributes to the extreme polarisation of different groups.

d) *Exhaust legitimate means*

Even in legitimate cases, violence ought to be a last resort. All peaceful means must be first exhausted. We are living in explosive times and there is need for much wisdom and serenity. We extend a fraternal invitation to all, but especially those organisations which are committed to the struggle for justice, to proceed courageously and honourably, always to maintain just objectives, and to make use of legitimate means of pressure rather than put all their trust in violence.

CONCLUSION

Christ's Violent Friends

We want to end our reflections by looking at that splendid vision of peace which is the Transfigured Lord. It is striking that the five people chosen to accompany the Divine Saviour in that theophany on Mount Tabor were five men of violent temperaments and deeds. Moses, Elias, Peter, James and John can be described in the terms used of Christians at Medellin, "they are not simply pacifists, because they are capable of fighting, but they prefer peace to war" . . . Jesus channelled the aggression of those temperaments towards a rich work of construction, of building up justice and peace in the world. Let us ask the Divine Patron of El Salvador to transfigure in the same way the rich potential of this people with whom He has chosen to share His name. To be His instrument for bringing about this transformation in His people is the reason for the Church's existence. That is why we have tried to reaffirm its identity and mission in the light of Christ. Only by being what He wants it to be will the Church be able to give more intelligent and effective service and support to the just aspirations of the people.

This is My Beloved Son : Listen to Him

The voice of the Father on that Holy Mountain is the best guarantee there is for the Church's mission among

men; which is to point out Christ as the beloved Son of God and only Saviour of mankind and to remind men of the supreme duty of listening to Him if they want to be truly free and happy.

Let us listen to Him ! He has much to say as He sees Himself surrounded by our people, as they look to Him with confidence at one of the most tragic and uncertain moments of our history.

We believe we are interpreting His divine word, as at the end of this pastoral letter, we address ourselves :

To all our Catholics, to our brothers and sisters of other Churches, and to all men of good will, reminding them that the Lord is present and that His voice speaks to us also from the misery of our people. Let us hear Him : "What you do to the least of my brethren you do to me" (Matthew 25:40).

To those who possess economic power, the Lord of the world says that they should not close their eyes selfishly to this situation. They should understand that only by sharing in justice and brotherhood with those who do not have this power can they cooperate for the good of the country, and will they enjoy that peace and happiness which cannot come from wealth accumulated at the expense of others. Listen to Him.

To the middle class, who have already assured a minimum of dignity for their lives, Jesus points out that there remains a majority who still do not have enough to live on. He urges them to support the poor and the peasants and not to be content with making their own gains secure. Listen to Him.

To the professional associations and to the intellectuals, the Divine Master, who is the light of all understanding, says that they should use their scientific and technical expertise to investigate the problems of our country and fulfill their professional obligations by looking for solutions to them. They should publicly declare their interest in the welfare of the country and not take refuge in an uncommitted knowledge and science, in a calm seclusion remote from the suffering of people. Hear Him.

Of the political parties and 'popular organisations' which have been the main concern of this pastoral letter, Christ,

the guide of nations and of history, requires that they learn to put their concern for the poor majority before their own interests, that they use the political system effectively and with justice and press honourably and boldly for the beginning of the transformation for which we long. Obey Him.

To the public authorities, who have the sacred duty of governing for the good of all, Christ, the King of Kings and Lord of Lords, addresses a call for a sense of truth, justice and of sincere service to the people.

Therefore :

1. let them pass laws which take into account the majority of people who live in the countryside where there are serious problems about land, wages and medical, social and educational facilities;
2. let them genuinely widen the narrow area of political discussion and give formal and real admission to the various political voices in the country;
3. let them give an opportunity to organise legally to those who have been unjustly deprived of this human right, especially the peasants;
4. let them take notice of the people's rejection of the Law for the Defence and Maintenance of Public Order and in its place let them promulgate other laws which do in fact guarantee human rights and peace; let them establish adequate channels for civil and political dialogue, so that no-one need be afraid to express ideas which may benefit the common good, even if they imply a criticism of the government;
5. let them stop the terrorisation of the peasantry and put an end to this tragic situation of confrontation between peasants, exploiting their poverty to organise some under the protection of the government and persecuting others just because they have organised themselves independently of the government to seek a reasonable standard of living and their rights;
6. let them win the confidence of the people with some intelligent and generous gestures such as the following : an amnesty for all prisoners who have not yet been brought before any court but who have 'disappeared' after being captured by the security forces; and a

chance of returning home to all those who have been expelled or who are unable to return to El Salvador for political reasons.

We believe that all this is the will of the Divine Saviour of the world and that the Father's command is: *He must be listened to!*

The Church Promises to Work and Pray

For its part the Church, which in this letter has reasserted its identity and explained its mission, promises to contribute to the general well-being of the country, its faith in Jesus Christ and its collaboration with all who are ready to make justice reign as the basis of a peace which will bring us real progress.

We turn with filial confidence to the intercession of our Queen and Mother, the Blessed Virgin of Peace, who is also a Patron of El Salvador. May she obtain for us from the Divine Saviour of the world an abundance of grace and good will for the transfiguration of our people.

With our blessing.

San Salvador, the Feast of the Transfiguration,
6 August 1978.

Oscar A. Romero

Archbishop of San Salvador

Arturo Rivera Damas

Bishop of Santiago de Maria

Book Reviews

A NEW COLONIALISM

The Pope from Poland edited by John Whale; Collins (Fount Original); pp. 271; £1.50.

The New Inquisition ? by Peter Hebblethwait; Collins (Fount Original); pp. 173; £1.25.

It is a question, really, of one's departure-point; which means, in the context of these two books, of one's attitude to the truth. For the liberal Catholic or Christian, I would suggest, truth is, to a greater or less degree, relative; capable of alteration, at least over time; moulded, to a fair extent, by circumstances and prevailing mood; something that man can, in fact, make for himself. The approach is subjective and conditional. There is a margin always for what is thought of as legitimate doubt. Certainty is for peasants, not the intellectual establishment. Out of this comes what is thought of as the right to unlimited academic freedom. This rests on the false assumption that freedom of choice is an end in itself. And this carries with it by implication a further supposed right of dissent from the pronouncements of the Church's Teaching Authority; a "right" that is made much of, particularly by a somewhat strident minority of religious men and women in the Catholic Church in the United States today.

By and large, I would think it fair to say that the Authors of these two books belong to this category, within which one can place a fair number of Catholics at present. Hence the inability of the Authors, despite considerable sympathy for the man himself, to understand fully what Pope John Paul II is trying to do. His task, as I see it, is the restoration of truth to all men and particularly the Faithful within the Church as she emerges from the fifteen years of confusion that came in the wake of the second Vatican Council. The Holy Father's starting-point is to be found, as it must, in his total addiction to God's truth as contained within Scripture and Tradition and upheld and promulgated by the Teaching Authority or Magisterium of the Church. This truth can be neither bent nor

discarded to suit prevailing circumstance. It can never be compromised. Which does not mean that its upholders should be arrogant or rude in their presentation of it; or self-contained in its possession. The kind of attitude that is marked by these characteristics is utterly alien to the character of Pope John Paul. He is firm, but always kind, though never soft. His love is genuine and true, quite free from false sentiment, always personalized. "It was like it was just him and me" said a girl to whom he wordlessly gave a flower outside St. Patrick's Cathedral, New York. And the Pope is a man of dialogue in the best sense of that maligned word. His hand is out to all because his mind and heart are set within objective truth. As such, he is fitted supremely to hold out his hand. Much of the trouble within and without the Church today is found in the fact that the first to hold out their hand are those whose minds and hearts are not so set. The same applies to those to whom their hand is outstretched. Like calls to like; the outgoing in this case is to themselves. They remained contained within their peer group; as such, quite unrepresentative of the Catholic body at large, whom they affect, nevertheless, to represent. It is all rather sad. The Authors of these two books are this way, I am afraid. This is why their assessment of Pope John Paul, though sympathetic in some ways, on the whole fails.

Take, for example, the brief comment of John Whale on the Pope's visit to the United States: "He marched straight into a complex and unfamiliar state of affairs and started laying about him. As a result, he brought the Papacy and the American Church into opposition". The presumption here would appear to be that truth can be compromised and that this is what the Pope should have done in matters of contraception, abortion, the remarriage of divorcees within the Church and so on. Instead, he condemned all three and more besides with great firmness. The Pope, of course, could do nothing else. This, precisely, is what Whale's liberal Christianity prevents him from seeing. Where he is concerned, the Pope is appallingly conservative, preaching "outmoded" moral generalities to the point where he takes no count of the climate of the age, still less of particular cases. He is without compassion.

(I wonder if it was for this reason that, during his visit to France at the end of May and in the words of the Paris correspondent of the *Times* (5/6/80), "50,000 youngsters cheered (the Pope) loudly when he insisted that permissiveness was not the key to happiness".) According to Whale's permissive thinking, which is increasingly out of tune with the outlook of the contemporary young, Pope John Paul is a hard, "conservative" Pole, who does not know the West. What Whale does not realise is that the Pope knows the truth and loves it; knows, too, that God's truth applies to all human beings, whether they be in East or West, rich or poor, black, brown, yellow or white or red. God's law binds them because he made them. What greater service can the Pope do, then, what greater compassion have for men and women than show them God's truth? Do you really do them a service by blessing what is, instead of reminding them of what should be? Do you really help people by giving them, however unintentionally and with whatever good will, lies to live off? Personally, I prefer Pope John Paul to Goebbels. The latter's daily diet of lies, handed out to the German people during the last war, did them little good in the end; merely hastened their ultimate degradation. Only a sentimental relativist could label an upholder of God's truth before men as devoid of compassion. Would Christ, too, fall under Whale's hammer on this account? Logically, He should do. His doctrine, on His own admission, was a hard one; and many left Him on that account.

Frankly, I would prefer the judgment of Christ or Pope John Paul in these matters to that of Whale, even though one is a Pole and the other a Jew. But, then, of course, if Christ was not divine? Clearly, the situation changes. I rather doubt whether any of the Authors of this book really believe that Jesus Christ was, in fact, true God and true man. Spirit-filled in some sort of super way, maybe—to the point where Good took hold of Him, as some would say, but this is not the same thing. True God? I think they wonder; they allow space for doubt. How fitted are they, then, to assess one who is utterly firm in his belief that Jesus Christ was God? Where is the common ground, the joint departure-point? There is none, really; there can't

be. If Christ was not God, Pope John Paul makes no sense at all; every trip he makes abroad adds up to no more than an exercise in self-contained arrogance. How on earth can Whale and his friends know what the Pope was up to, if they no longer (if they ever did) understand what Christ was up to Himself when he lived amongst men? There can be no sound judgment here. Such is impossible.

Whale remains undeterred. With all the certainty of those who find themselves in confident possession of half the truth, he writes of the American Catholic scene: "So as the American Church entered the 80's its bishops understood better than the Pope that the day of dogmatic morality was long gone. His list of things not to be thought of they were already thinking about every day. Divorce was identified by Archbishop Edward McCarthy of Miami as 'the main problem we face—no doubt about it'. Sample conversations suggest that the great majority of American bishops agree with him. But they are a long way beyond merely ruling divorce inadmissible and therefore divorced people unwelcome at church. They recognise that such a course would defeat their aims, both pastorally and in point of Catholic numerical advance". But is numerical advance, rather than the promulgation of God's truth, the main concern of the Catholic Church? And, secondly, even if permissible (which it is not), will the fudging of God's truth bring numerical success? On both counts Whale's liberal mind is sadly at sea. The same would seem to apply to Peter Hebblethwaite, the final pages of whose somewhat badly named book, *The New Inquisition?*, appear to me to rest on the rather impertinent assumption that the Pope is on the whole unqualified to deal with the cases of men like Kung and Schillebeeckx because unacquainted with what is called the "New Theology". I would have thought acquaintance with God's truth the more important here; but there you are. Neither the Authors of the assessment of Pope John, nor Hebblethwaite in his separate discussion-book on the cases of Kung and Schillebeeckx, appear to recognise the priority that must be given in these matters to God's truth if, indeed, there is in their minds such a thing as that. I incline to doubt it; under the circum-

stances, why bother with Grace, which is, of course, central to this whole issue!

We are back again at a point made earlier in this review-article. Unless you are a member of the prevailing peer group, the new in-Establishment of disaffected liberal Catholics within the Church, capable of dropping the appropriate names, knowing the "right" people and being in the "right" places at the "right" time, you will be relegated by this in-Establishment to the ranks of the Catholic Proletariat, that collection of lesser breeds without the law on whom the new in-people within the Church affect to gaze down from a great height. Insult is added to injury when these same new in-people within the Church actually claim with such arrogance to speak for those whom they have been so very quick to proletarianize. The new in-people suffer from the disease—common in other fields—of thinking that what is good for them is good for those within the Church whom they have so gratuitously proletarianized and whom they affect to represent, with no justification whatsoever. So, for example, Hebblethwaite can write that Kung's demotion has sent shock waves through the Church. With all respect, I have to say that he does not know what he is talking about here. His ear is so far removed from the ground, way out of hearing of the proletariat whom he neither knows nor understands. In fact, what Kung's demotion did was to send a wave, not of shock but of sheer relief right through the Church. The only ones who snarled and talked about persecution and the "right" of dissent were the in-people, not the rank-and-filers. These were immensely happy. Thank God, he's done it, they said. We want more of that. Not because they are vindictive. Simply because they want their children safe; just that.

Thus Hebblethwaite can write with sorrow of the supposed unkind treatment meted out to Kung, apparently without a thought of the havoc wrought by Kung's teaching when filtered into the minds of the young by, say, secularist go-go religious sisters in the United States, which unfortunately is full of them at the moment. Under these circumstances where does Pope John Paul's duty lie?

In blessing error by tolerating its continued promulgation, as so many weak-kneed bishops do; or combatting it at source in response to one's duty to uphold the right of the Catholic young, in particular, to be taught the truth? For most of us within the Church—the recently proletarianized mass of the Faithful—the answer is only too obvious. For the in-people it is the other way round. The proletariat come last. The thing that must be upheld at all costs is the prestige of the peer group. It is the Pope's duty to do just that. Failure here stamps him as a no-good; a reactionary. Or, as Hebblethwaite implies, a Polish Pope. That's his trouble. He's not one of us. He won't learn from us. Therefore, he'll always be wrong. Just like a couple of District Commissioners talking about a somewhat uppish "native authority" in the old colonial days. What you have here, in fact, is new colonialism within the Church. I must say it makes me rather sick.

Paul Crane, S.J.

Remark made by a Roman theologian visiting England last year:

"Of all the Hierarchies in Europe, that of England is least well thought of in Rome—not because it teaches heresy necessarily, but because it refuses to teach the Faith".

ST. DUTHAC'S BOOK SERVICE

Catholicism & Modernity

By Prof. J. Hitchcock. Price £8.70. (\$16.00).

The Church Learned and the Revolt of the Scholars

By Philip Trower. Price £1.40. (\$2.50).

The Battle for the American Church

Price £8.80. (\$16.20).

St. Thomas Aquinas, Orthodoxy, & Neo-Modernism in the Church

By Renee Casin. Price £1.80. (\$3.40).

Papal Teachings : the Liturgy

By the Benedictine Monks of Solesnes. Price £3.70. (\$6.70).

Transformation in Christ

By Dietrich von Hildebrand. Price £4.55. (\$8.50).
(also all works still in print by this author).

Land of Crosses

By Michael Bourdeaux. (The struggle for religious freedom in Lithuania 1919-1978). Price £3.75. (\$7.00).

Where we got the Bible

By Henry C. Graham. Price £1.60. (\$3.00).

The Acting Person

A Contribution to Phenomonological Anthropology.
By Pope John Paul II. Price £8.25. (\$15.00).

(All prices include postage)

Write for full Book List to :

ST. DUTHAC'S BOOK SERVICE

39 Blenheim Park Road, S. Croydon, CR2 6BG, G.B.

THE CRISIS IN THE CHURCH —

regarding this subject, have you read Michael Davies on:

THE TRIDENTINE MASS

Reduced from 40p plus p&p to 40p/\$1.00 post free.

THE NEW MASS

Reduced from 40 plus p&p to 40p/\$1.00 post free.

THE ROMAN RITE DESTROYED

Reduced from 50p plus p&p to 45p/\$1.00 post free.

**We will supply a complete set of the above for
£1.00 / \$2.50 post free**

THE ORDER OF MELCHISEDECH

A penetrating study on the new rite of Ordination, and the attempt to circumvent *Apostolicae Curae*. (Paper 232 pp 8 illus.)

Special offer to *Christian Order* readers: £3.00/
\$7.00 post free.

APOLOGIA PRO MARCEL LEFEBVRE

No one can talk knowledgeably about the Archbishop's case without first mastering the complete documentation, for and against presented in this book.

Paper 460 pages. 25 illus. £4.00 plus 75p p&p.

Available, for cash with order, subject to availability,
from:

AUGUSTINE PUBLISHING CO.

Chulmleigh, Devon EX18 7HL, U.K.

Free list of traditional Catholic titles sent on request.